BY ORDER OF THE COMMANDER,
PACIFIC AIR FORCES

PACAF DIRECTORY 90-201

14 DECEMBER 2001

Command Policy

CIVIL ENGINEERS MISSION PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

NOTICE: This publication is available digitally on the AFDPO WWW site at: **http://afpubs.hq.af.mil.**

OPR: HQ PACAF/CEOS (Capt Dean Hartman)

Certified by: HQ PACAF/CEO (Col John D. Fouser)

Supersedes PACAFDIR 90-201, 22 October 1999

Pages: 73

Distribution: F

This directory implements AFPD 90-2, *Inspector General - The Inspection System.* It applies to wing level Civil Engineer Squadrons, Civil Engineer Support Organizations, and the 554th RED HORSE Squadron, having responsibilities for real property maintenance and support, environmental protection, fire protection, explosive ordnance disposal, readiness, engineering readiness, and facility construction. This directory supports guidance from Public Law, Executive Orders, DoD Directives, safety regulations, and Air Force and PACAF policies. These compliance references have been identified on the attached checklist items.

The items listed do not constitute the order nor limit the scope of the inspection/assessment. As a minimum, units should use this directory in conjunction with their annual unit self-assessment. The objective is to identify deficiencies, which preclude attainment of required capabilities. Units can supplement this publication to add internal compliance items. HQ may use this directory in whole or in part during visits or exercises. Users may add any item(s), which, in the exercise of good judgment, requires examination. This directory applies to Air National Guard (ANG) units when published in ANGIND2 and does not apply to the US Air Force Reserve units and members. Critical inspection items are in bold type and indicated with a **(#)**.

SUMMARY OF REVISIONS

This revision redefines critical compliance inspection items as those mandated by law, Executive Order, DoD Directive, safety, or dictated by USAF or MAJCOM policy; **Attachment 1**, Section 10, War Reserve Material Management (added); **Attachment 1**, Section 11, Installation Exercise Program, was extracted from Readiness Flight; PACAF Criteria for NBC Defense and Air Base Operability for Combat Employment Readiness Inspections (CERI) was deleted due to on-going revision of criteria; **Attachment 2**, Civil Engineer Initial Readiness Response Inspection (IRRI) Objectives (added); **Attachment 4**, PACAF Fire Protection Self-Inspection, IRRI and CERI Criteria (added); **Attachment 5**, 554 Red Horse Squadron Unit Compliance Inspection Checklist (added). New or revised material is indicated by an (|).

1. *Authorized release of Word (.doc) file can only be acquired by contacting the appropriate OPR directly.*

DAVID W. DEFOLIART, Colonel, USAF
The Civil Engineer

Attachment 1

CIVIL ENGINEER MISSION PERFORMANCE CHECKLIST

A1.1. CIVIL ENGINEER SQUADRON

A1.1.1. Commander

A1.1.1.1. (#) Did the Commander establish quality standards and feedback mechanisms to assess performance in meeting mission requirements and customers' needs? (AFI 32-1001, Section A)

A1.1.2. Training (In conjunction with the unit education and training manager)

A1.1.2.1. (#) Did the unit manage required on-the-job training and formal training (AETC schools) and education (e.g., AFIT) for its personnel, including projecting all future requirements? (AFI 36-2201, para 4.9; AFI 32-1001, para 1.2)

A1.1.3. Outsourcing Program

A1.1.3.1. If applicable, were outsourcing processes following the guidelines in AFI 38-203, *AF Commercial Activities Program Instruction*?

A1.1.3.2. If applicable, were studied functions that were kept in-house by Most Efficient Organization (MEO) performing within the requirements of the PWS and were actual costs with-in the in-house cost estimates? (AFI 38-203, chapter 20)

A1.1.4. Safety Program (In conjunction with the unit safety monitor)

A1.1.4.1. (#) Did the Commander ensure an active safety program was implemented within the unit, and supervisors complied with general safety, fire prevention, and occupational health requirements? (AFOSH Standard 91-10, Chap 2)

A1.1.4.2. (#) Did the Commander ensure Air Force Occupational and Environmental Safety, Fire Protection and Health (AFOSH) requirements were met? (AFI 91-301, para 2.11 and 2.12)

A1.1.5. War Reserve Material (WRM) Program

A1.1.5.1. Was there an effective WRM program and did the Commander appoint primary and alternate WRM monitors? (PACAFI 25-101, para 1.52)

A1.1.5.2. Did the Commander ensure the portions of base OPlans, OPORDs, and BSPs, for which the organization is responsible, accurately addressed the use of WRM? (PACAFI 25-101, para 1.52)

A1.1.5.3. Did the BCE establish a WRM maintenance management plan? (PACAFI 25-101, para 1.46.6)

A1.1.6. Status of Resources and Training System (SORTS) Program

A1.1.6.1. Was there an effective SORTS program within the unit with at least two SORTS monitors appointed (primary and alternate, at a minimum) and trained? (AFI 10-201, para 1.17)

A1.1.6.2. (#) Did the Commander review, initial, and date the SORTS DOC statement (AF Form 723) directly after assuming command, and annually thereafter? (AFI 10-201, para 1.17)

A1.1.6.3. Did the commander review SORTS results for measured resource areas, assign overall ratings for UTCs and the unit, and ensure that adequate remarks were included? (AFI 10-201, Chap 1)

A1.2. OPERATIONS FLIGHT

A1.2.1. Flight Management

A1.2.1.1. (#) (Validate in each of the shops/workcenters visited) Was a locally-developed safety program established for the various shops/workcenters? (AFI 91-301, para 7.3)

A1.2.1.2. (#) (Validate in each of the applicable shops/workcenters visited) Did the unit have an approved and coordinated Confined Space Entry Program? (AFOSH Std 91-25, Chap 2)

A1.2.1.2.1. Were the required number of personnel trained on tasks of entry supervisor, confined space entrant and confined space attendants? (AFOSH 91-25, paras 2.13, 2.14, and 2.15)

A1.2.1.3. (#) (Validate in each of the shops/workcenters visited; validate program implementation, supervisor involvement, and accuracy/currency of AF Form 623s, among others) Did an effective training program (OJT, formal training, and education) exist for assigned personnel in the various shops/workcenters? (AFI 36-2201, para 4.10-4.15; AFI 32-1001 para 1.2; 3EXXX CFETPs)

A1.2.1.4. (#) Were CE work request approval officials designated, and was their approval authority delineated? (AFI 32-1001 and AFI 32-1032)

A1.2.1.4.1. Did the Interim Work Information Management System (IWIMS) reflect current approval officials?

A1.2.1.5. Did the unit ensure work was not performed on real property under warranty?

A1.2.1.6. Did the Flight establish quality standards and feedback mechanisms to assess performance in meeting mission requirements and customers' needs? (AFI 32-1001, Sec A)

A1.2.1.7. (#) Was there a RWP program developed and was it effective in providing adequate maintenance to equipment? (AFI 32-1001, para 3 & 10; AFPAM 32-1004V2, Chap 8; AFPAM 32-1004V3, Chap 5; AFPAM 32-1004V5, Chap 4)

A1.2.1.7.1. Was maintenance accomplished as scheduled in the RWP program? (AFI 32-1001, para 3)

A1.2.1.7.2. Were Maintenance Action Sheets developed and did the craftsmen utilize them to accomplish maintenance? (AFI 32-1001, para 3; AFPAM 32-1004V2, Chap 8)

A1.2.1.7.3. Were supervisors/work leaders following-up on RWP and did they ensure that it was adequate to effectively maintain equipment? (AFI 32-1001, para 3, AFPAM 32-1004V2, Chap 8)

A1.2.1.8. Were AF Form 103's being processed for any work that disrupted aircraft or vehicular flow, base utilities services, protection by fire or intrusion alarm systems, or other routine installation activities? (AFI 32-1001, para 6.6)

A1.2.1.9. Were reimbursable customers provided with the costs of work or services performed on their facilities? (AFI 32-1001, para 1.11, 1.12)

A1.2.2. Self-Help Program

A1.2.2.1. (#) Was the Self-Help program managed consistent with the guidance provided in AFPAM 32-1098?

A1.2.2.2. Did the unit incorporate and/or implement methods, procedures, and lessons learned that were outlined in the *PACAF Commander's Guide to Self-Help Success*?

A1.2.3. Facility Maintenance Element (AFPAM 32-1004V3)

A1.2.3.1. Program Management

A1.2.3.1.1. Were facility maintenance schedules reviewed to ensure efficient and effective service was provided to customers? (AFPAM 32-1004V3, para 4.5)

A1.2.3.1.2. (#) Was a maintenance schedule developed and publicized? (AFPAM 32-1004V3, para 1.3.2, 1.3.3, 3.2)

A1.2.3.1.2.1. Were the visit frequencies based on volume of maintenance for each given facility? (AFPAM 32-1004V3, para 1.3.2, 1.3.3, 3.2)

A1.2.3.1.3. Did the Manager, or designated representative, visit the facility prior to the maintenance team visit? (AFPAM 32-1004V3, para 1.3.1)

A1.2.3.1.3.1. Were maintenance items identified, documented, and prioritized for accomplishment? (AFPAM 32-1004V3, para 1.3.2, 1.3.3, 3.2)

A1.2.3.1.4. (#) Were facility managers identified and trained? (AFPAM 32-1004V3, para 1.3.1, 2.3)

A1.2.3.1.4.1. Did facility managers know how to identify and report maintenance requirements? (AFPAM 32-1004V3, Chap 2)

A1.2.3.1.4.2. (#) Were customers kept informed regarding who was the single point of contact for support, inspection, maintenance, repair, and modification of real property? (AFPAM 32-1004V3, Chap 2)

A1.2.3.1.5. (#) Was Direct Scheduled Work (DSW) properly categorized as Emergency, Urgent, or Routine? Was this work accomplished in a timely manner? (AFI 32-1001, para 8; AFPAM 32-1004V3, Chap 4)

A1.2.3.1.6. (#) Were all work requests (AF Form 332) coordinated with the appropriate agencies (Fire, Safety, Bio-Env, Env, & Comm) prior to approval? (AFI 32-1001, para 6; AFPAM 32-1004V3, para 4.3)

A1.2.3.2. HVAC Shop Operations

A1.2.3.2.1. Were adequate tools available to perform efficient maintenance and repair of heating, ventilation, air conditioning, refrigeration, and support equipment? (Modern Refrigeration & Air Conditioning, Chapters 12-20, Althouse/Turnquist/Bracciane, ©1996 by The Goodheart-Willcox Company Inc; AFOSHSTD 91-10, para 2.5-2.7)

A1.2.3.2.2. (#) Were heating systems utilizing fossil fuel analyzed and adjusted for peak combustion efficiency annually or in accordance with manufacture recommendations? (AFI 32-1068, para 2.4)

A1.2.3.2.3. (#) **Did the HVAC/R shop maintain an effective Refrigerant Management Program and work towards eliminating Class 1 Ozone Depleting Chemicals (Chlorofluorocarbon {CFC} 111, 112, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, & 217)? (AFI 32-7080, para 3.1; AFPAM 32-1004V2, para 5.2.2)**

A1.2.3.2.4. Did the HVAC/R shop maintain an effective industrial water treatment program (to enhance heat transfer, reduce scale/algae, and prevent biological fouling in cooling towers)? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, para 5.3.4)

A1.2.3.2.5. Did the technicians have a well-lit, ventilated, and secure industrial water treatment laboratory, which was equipped with adequate counter space, storage, and testing agents? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, para 5.3.4)

A1.2.3.2.6. Were mechanical rooms maintained in compliance with applicable safety guidance, kept free of debris and unauthorized parts, have adequate lighting and ventilation, and were secured from unauthorized entry? (AFOSHSTD 91-10, para 2.4.7 & 8.1-8.4)

A1.2.3.2.7. Did supervisors/work leaders review MAS (minimum of annually) to ensure maintenance actions and frequencies were adequately maintaining equipment? (AFPAM 32-1004V3, para 5.1-5.2; AFPAM 32-1004V5, para 1.3.2-1.3.4)

A1.2.3.3. Central Plants Systems

A1.2.3.3.1. (#) Did HVAC/R technicians implement proper attendance, perform required inspections, and maintain required operating logs for each type of applicable plant (AFF 1163 High Temperature Water Distribution, AFF 1165 High Temperature Water Plant Operating Log, AFF 1458 Daily Steam Boiler Operating Log, AFF 1459 Water Treatment Operating Log for Steam and Hot Water Boilers, and AFF 1464 Steam Boiler Plant Operating Log)? (AFI 32-1068, para 3.5.2, Table 1, and 3.5.7)

A1.2.3.3.2. Were boiler operating logs properly maintained and reviewed by the Base Civil Engineer for plants operating at 4.1 MW (14 MBTU/H) or larger (HQ PACAF/CECI did not require review of operating logs)? (AFI 32-1068, para 3.5.2)

A1.2.3.3.3. Were technicians trained to detect and correct heat plant equipment malfunctions or irregularities that could disrupt service? (AFI 32-1068, para 3.5.1)

A1.2.3.3.4. Did a Recurring Work Program provide seasonal overhauls of individual heating plants and systems? (AFI 32-1068, para 3.5.3)

A1.2.3.3.5. (#) Were required periodic high-pressure vessel inspections performed by qualified inspectors and is HQ PACAF/CECI or CEOO promptly notified when a boiler was determined to be unsafe to operate? (AFI 32-1068, para 3.5.7)

A1.2.3.3.6. Were steam traps maintained and was condensate from steam systems returned to the central plants? (AFI 32-1068, para 2.4.4, 3.5.3-.3.5.3.2.3, 3.5.4 and 3.5.4.1)

A1.2.3.3.7. Were steam and condensate leaks scheduled for repair? (AFI 32-1068, para 2.4.4, 3.5.3-3.5.3.2.3, 3.5.4 and 3.5.4.1)

A1.2.3.4. Environmental Control Systems

A1.2.3.4.1. Did a random selection of several environmental control systems indicate controls were not by-passed, dampers and valve operators were functional, and thermostats were firmly mounted and operational? (*Modern Refrigeration & Air Conditioning*, Chap 28, para 7.2, Althouse/Turnquist/Bracciane, ©1996 by The Goodheart-Willcox Company, Inc.; *ASHRAE Handbook,* HVAC Systems and Equipment, Chapter 1, ©2000; *HVAC Control Systems*, Chapters 1-6, by Raymond K. Schneider, ©1981)

A1.2.3.4.2. (#) Were environmental controls maintained to conform to designed sequence of operation ? **(*ASHRAE Handbook,* HVAC Systems and Equipment, Chapter 1,** ©2000; *HVAC Control Systems*, Chapters 1-6, by Raymond K. Schneider, ©1981)

A1.2.3.4.3. Were valves, switches and other manual controls marked or tagged to indicate normal operating position and/or was a diagram posted in the mechanical room that contained this information? (*ASHRAE Handbook,* HVAC Systems and Equipment, Chapter 1, ©2000; *HVAC Control Systems*, Chapters 1-6, by Raymond K. Schneider, ©1981)

A1.2.4. Infrastructure Support Element, (AFPAM 32-1004V5)

A1.2.4.1. Electrical Systems

A1.2.4.1.1. (#) Did the electrical superintendent ensure all electrical work was completed IAW the latest version of the National Electrical Code, National Electrical Safety Code and OSHA? (AFI 32-1064, para 2)

A1.2.4.1.2. (#) Did the foremen and Maintenance Engineer maintain required technical data on the electrical distribution system? (AFI 32-1063, para 1.8; AFI 32-1064, para 2.17; AFJMAN 32-1082, chap 1)

A1.2.4.1.3. Were accurate one-line diagrams, as-builts, and schematics of systems available in the shop and were workers trained and knowledgeable on the system? (AFJMAN 32-1082, chap 1& 6)

A1.2.4.1.3.1. Did shop personnel establish procedures to ensure one-line diagrams, as-builts, and schematics were updated by CEC/CEOE or applicable office of responsibility when new work was completed and/or when discrepancies were noted in the field? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, chap 6)

A1.2.4.1.4. Did the unit maintain a power outage record, which included details concerning the operation of protective relays and other devices? (AFI 32-1063, paras 1.6 and 7.7)

A1.2.4.1.5. Were necessary warning signs and barriers available and used by the workers? (AFOSHSTD 91-10, para 2.15)

A1.2.4.1.6. (#) Was a qualified safe clearance manager designated by the CEO? (AFI 32-1064, para 4.1.1)

A1.2.4.1.6.1. (#) Did the Infrastructure Support Element supervisor maintain a list of personnel qualified to receive safe clearances? (AFI 32-1064, para 4.1.1)

A1.2.4.1.7. Did shop supervisors review service calls and other work requirements to analyze recurring problems to determine if shop practices/quality of work were adequate or if major components or systems required replacement?

A1.2.4.1.8. (#) Was live-line maintenance performed only to meet critical mission requirements, prevent injury to persons, or protect property, and was it appropriately authorized (by CEO)? (AFI 32-1064, para 5.2.1.1)

A1.2.4.1.9. (#) Did the shop ensure procedures were in-place to meet the following requirements: ensure a certified safety observer was present when repairs and maintenance were performed around energized equipment; the two-person concept always used when high voltage circuits or energized circuits of any voltage were being installed or maintained; electricians followed safe clearance procedures to clear lines and equipment for work in the de-energized condition; all de-energized transmission and distribution lines and equipment were properly tested for voltage and grounded prior to initiating work? (AFI 32-1064, para 2.2, 4.1, 4.5, 5.1 and 5.2.3)

A1.2.4.1.10. (#) Had a comprehensive lock-out, tag-out program been instituted? (AFI 32-1064, para 4.2)

A1.2.4.1.10.1. Were all personnel properly trained on this program, and was the training documented on AF Form 55? (AFI 32-1064, para 4.2)

A1.2.4.1.10.2. Were local procedures established for proper switching, blocking, tagging, and lockout when switching by remote control? (AFI 32-1064, para 4.2)

A1.2.4.1.10.3. (#) Were safe clearance procedures for blocking, tagging and grounding of electrical switching and controlling devices followed? (AFI 32-1064, para 4)

A1.2.4.1.10.4. Were proper forms used when switching, blocking, tagging and locking out (AF Form 979, Danger Tag, AF Form 982, Do Not Start Tag, AF Form 980, Caution Tag, and AF Form 269, Electrical Facilities Safe Clearance Form)? (AFI 32-1064, para 4.1.4)

A1.2.4.1.11. (#) Did personnel receive annual CPR proficiency training and was the training documented on the AF Form 55? (AFI 32-1064, para 2.13; AFOSHSTD 91-10, para 2.1.1.2)

A1.2.4.1.12. (#) Were required warning signs located where electrical hazardous conditions existed and did they conform to OSHA standards (stating the voltage present in the protected area)? (AFJMAN 32-1082, para 3-16; AFOSHSTD 91-20)

A1.2.4.1.13. (#) Did electrical supervisors review job requirements with their workers to identify potential hazards, methods to control those hazards, and proper procedures for safely working with them? (AFI 32-1064, para 2.2; AFI 91-301, para 7.3)

A1.2.4.1.14. Were safety briefings being conducted at least monthly and did they utilize a variety of aids such as safety posters, mock-ups (using the actual equipment where appropriate), pictures, and films? (AFI 32-1064, para 2.4)

A1.2.4.1.15. Were personnel trained on safety and environmental precautions required to handle PCB- contaminated transformers, capacitors and other devices? (AFI 32-1064, para 3)

A1.2.4.1.16. Were monthly visual and a yearly infrared inspections conducted on each (entire) substation? (AFJMAN 32-1082, para 3.5)

A1.2.4.1.17. Were electrical controls and panels clear of obstacles and was adequate workspace provided around electrical systems? (AFI 32-1064, AFJMAN 32-1082)

A1.2.4.1.18. (#) Were workers properly equipped and trained to use and maintain tools and personal protective equipment (paying particular attention to rubber insulating protective equipment, e.g. rubber gloves, sleeves, line hoses, hoods, and covers) and hotline tools? (AFI 32-1064, para 2.11; AFOSHSTDs 91-10 and 12-13)

A1.2.4.1.18.1. (#) Did electrical insulating equipment receive periodic electrical testing and were inspections performed prior to use? (AFI 32-1064, para 2.11; AFOSHSTDs 91-10 and 12-13)

A1.2.4.1.18.2. (#) Were rubber gloves and sleeves di-electrically tested every six months when assigned and in active use? (AFOSHSTD 91-31, para 3.6.4.8.3)

A1.2.4.1.18.3. (#) Were all other rubber goods tested IAW applicable guidelines? (AFOSHSTD 91-31, para 3.6.3-3.6.4)

A1.2.4.1.18.4. (#) Were hot line tools tested semi-annually? (AFJMAN 32-1082, para 15-18a)

A1.2.4.1.18.5. (#) Did workers wear proper personal protective equipment? (AFI 32-1063; AFOSHSTD 91-31, para 2.11-2.13)

A1.2.4.1.19. (#) Were Line and High-Reach trucks di-electrically tested on a semi-annual cycle? (T.O. 36C-01-04)

A1.2.4.1.20. Did the foremen maintain a log of all facility grounding and lightning protection systems, their types, and maintenance performed? (AFI 32-1065)

A1.2.4.1.21. Were instructions prepared and posted (in advance) for potential emergencies, and did they incorporate employee actions, set-up alternatives for key personnel, and establish follow-up procedures? (AFOSHSTD 91-301)

A1.2.4.1.22. In conjunction with CEC/CEOE or appropriate responsible office, was the Electrical Distribution System portion of the Infrastructure Plan properly maintained? (AFI 32-7062, Atch 6)

A1.2.4.1.23. Were all personnel required to climb wooden poles certified in pole climbing at least once a year? (OSHA Standard 1910.269)

A1.2.4.1.23.1. Did the shop have an OSHA-approved fall protection device? (OSHA Standard 1926.502 {D})

A1.2.4.1.23.2. Were all climbing evaluations being documented on an AF Form 1098 and maintained in the individual's training record? (OSHA Standard 1910.269)

A1.2.4.1.24. Were all the weeds/vegetation and debris removed from substation yards and pole yards? (AMAMN 32-1185, para 2.6.2.5)

A1.2.4.1.25. **(#) Did the shop conduct inspection, test, and maintenance (ITM) of all fire protection systems IAW UFC 3-600-02, Chapter 2?**

A1.2.4.1.25.1. Were all craftsman tasked with the ITM of fire protection systems and subsystems appropriately trained and qualified? (UFC 3-600-02, para 1-8.1)

A1.2.4.1.25.2. Were permanent records of ITM tasks maintained as required? (UFC 3-600-02, para 1-9)

A1.2.4.2. Water and Wastewater Systems

A1.2.4.2.1. Were all necessary operation and maintenance publications available to shop personnel? (MIL-HDBK-1164, para 2.1)

A1.2.4.2.2. Were the primary wastewater operation and maintenance reference publications (Sacramento Series) available to shop personnel? (MIL-HDBK-1138, para 1.1.1)

A1.2.4.2.3. Was the current edition of the Uniform Plumbing Code available to shop personnel? (AFI 32-1066, para 3.1)

A1.2.4.2.4. Were gate valve and fire hydrants in the water distribution system properly maintained and were the hydrants flow tested as required? (MIL-HDBK-1164, para 8.3.3.2, 8.4.1.1, and 8.4.1.2)

A1.2.4.2.5. (#) Was required ITM of installed fire protection systems accomplished at the appropriate frequencies? (AFJMAN 32-1059, TABLES 5-1, 7-1, 9-1, and 11-1)

A1.2.4.2.6. (#) Were personnel assigned to carry out the cross-connection control program properly certified in testing, installing, and maintaining backflow prevention devices? (AFI 32-1066, para 15)

A1.2.4.2.7. Were all base facilities surveyed every 5 years (at a minimum) to determine adequacy of existing devices and review the need for additional backflow prevention devices (include military family housing only if underground lawn sprinklers were installed)? (AFI 32-1066, para 12.1)

A1.2.4.2.8. Were current utility maps of water and sewer systems available to shop personnel? (AFI 32-1067, para 10.2; MIL-HDBK-1164, para 3.5.5; *Principles and Practices of Water Supply Operations Series: Water Transmission & Distribution*, Chap 15, American Water Works Association (AWWA))

A1.2.4.2.9. Were schematic diagrams depicting all major piping and control valves posted on the wall at each pumping station/plant? (MIL-HDBK-1164, para 9.2.2)

A1.2.4.2.10. (#) Were operating records and logs for water/wastewater treatment plants properly prepared and maintained? (AFI 32-1067, para 10.1.1 and 10.1.2)

A1.2.4.2.11. (#) Were water well records properly maintained? (AFI 32-1067, Water Systems, para 10.2)

A1.2.4.2.12. Was a file of manufacturer's maintenance instructions for all equipment on hand and available for use by personnel? (AFI 32-1067, para 10.2; MIL-HDBK-1164, para 3.5.8 and 11.3.3)

A1.2.4.2.13. (#) **Were septic tanks, oil water separators and grease traps cleaned and properly maintained? (MIL-HDBK 1138, para 3.2, tables 1 and 2; para 4.2.1 and table 3, para 5.3.4)**

A1.2.4.2.14. (#) Were leak or infiltration/inflow detection surveys on water and sewer lines performed as required? (MIL-HDBK-1164, para 8.1.2.2; MIL-HDBK-1165, para 4.3)

A1.2.4.2.15. Were swimming pools properly operated and maintained? (AFOSH 48-14, para 1.2.2; MIL-HDBK 1164, Tables 52 and 53)

A1.2.4.2.16. Were dead end pipes in the water distribution system flushed and disinfected at least annually or after a water main break? (MIL-HDBK-1164, para 8.1.2.40)

A1.2.4.3. Liquid Fuels Maintenance (LFM)

A1.2.4.3.1. (#) Did the LFM Shop have a schedule for cleaning and inspecting all bulk fuel storage tanks? (AFM 85-16, para 10-9c)

A1.2.4.3.2. (#) Did the LFM Shop have at least one (two or more recommended) MAJCOM-certified POL Tank Cleaning Supervisor? (AFM 85-16, para 11-2)

A1.2.4.3.3. Did the LFM Shop have completed AF Form 172s (Tank Inspection Summary) on file for the last cleanings and inspections done on all bulk file storage tanks? (AFM 85-16, Atch 3)

A1.2.4.3.4. (#) Did the LFM Shop have a recurring work plan to accomplish, document, and report quarterly, annual and five-year pipeline pressure tests? (AFM 85-16, para 8-11 and 10-13)

A1.2.4.4. Power Production

A1.2.4.4.1. (#) Did the unit maintain an accurate inventory of all emergency generators and report status annually to HQ PACAF/CEOO (or CECI)? (AFI 32-1063, para 1.7)

A1.2.4.4.1.1. Did personnel reconcile inventory results with real property records for RPIE generator accountability, or with custodian authorization and custody receipt listing (CA/CRL) records for EAID generators? (AFI 32-1063, para 1.7)

A1.2.4.4.2. Were AF-operated prime power plants properly maintained, and did personnel maintain all required data and information? (AFI 32-1062; AFI 32 –1063, para 1.7-1.12)

A1.2.4.4.3. Were all excess real property (RPIE) generators reported to the HQ PACAF/CEOO for disposition instructions? (AFI 32-1063, para 3.1)

A1.2.4.4.4. (#) Were all authorized Equipment Authorization Inventory Data (EAID) generators properly accounted for on the equipment custodian CA/CRL? (AFI-32-1063, para 3.2)

A1.2.4.4.5. (#) Were AF Form 487s maintained for all standby generators and were they validated at least annually (to verify generators and associated equipment were adequate and reliable)? (AFI 32-1063, para 4)

A1.2.4.4.6. Were all generators carrying a load of less than 25 percent of capacity properly identified for replacement? (AFI 32-1063, para 4)

A1.2.4.4.7. (#) Were all generators exercised for one continuous hour each month? (AFI 32-1063, para 7.1.1)

A1.2.4.4.8. (#) Were all EAID generators assigned to a specific authorized facility and exercised annually while connected to the supported facility or system? (AFI 32-1063, para 7.2)

A1.2.4.4.9. (#) Were schematic diagrams developed and maintained for each generator facility? (AFI 32-1062, para 4.3.2)

A1.2.4.4.10. (#) Were (step-by-step) operating procedures developed to suit specific local conditions and equipment, posted, and updated/reviewed annually? (AFI 32-1062, 4.4)

A1.2.4.4.11. Were historical records being maintained on all generator sets? (AFI 32-1063, para 5.5)

A1.2.4.4.12. Did Power Production personnel ensure engine-lubricating systems were maintained IAW technical orders? (AFI 32-1062, para A3.4)

A1.2.4.4.13. Did Power Production personnel ensure engine-cooling systems were maintained IAW technical orders? (AFI 32-1062, para A3.5)

A1.2.4.4.14. (#) Did Power Production and Fire Protection personnel establish an effective aircraft arresting system training program, and did written guidance clearly define roles and responsibilities during duty and non-duty hours? (AFI 32-1043, 1.3.5 and 1.3.8)

A1.2.4.4.15. (#) Were all aircraft arresting systems certified annually? (T.O. 3 5E8-2- I - I 0 1, para 1-3)

A1.2.4.4.16. (#) Were required records maintained on all aircraft arresting systems? (T.O. 35E8-2-1-101, para 1-4)

A1.2.4.4.16.1. Were records maintained that record aircraft arresting systems effective pendant height? (AFI 32-1043, 1.3.11)

A1.2.4.4.17. (#) Was preventive maintenance performed on BAK-12 aircraft arresting systems IAW T.O. 35E82-5-1, Fig 5.1?

A1.2.4.4.18. (#) Was preventive maintenance performed on BAK-13 aircraft arresting systems IAW T.O. 35E82-7, Fig 5.1?

A1.2.4.4.19. (#) Was preventive maintenance performed on BAK-14 aircraft arresting systems IAW T.O. 35E82-8-1, Table 5-1?

A1.2.5. Material Acquisition Element (AFPAM 32-1004V4)

A1.2.5.1. Material Management

A1.2.5.1.1. (#) **Did the CoMA ensure all material transactions in support of CE operations were processed through CEMAS, with any exceptions documented in writing? (AFPAM 32-1004V4, para 1.5)**

A1.2.5.1.2. Did the CoMA establish local procedures to provide materials for mission requirements during other than normal duty hours? (AFPAM 32-1004V4, para 1.5)

A1.2.5.1.3. Did the CoMA ensure CE items subject to repair cycle control were properly managed and controlled according to the due-in-from-maintenance (DIFM) concept? (AFPAM 32-1004V4, para 1.5)

A1.2.5.1.4. (#) Did the CoMA properly manage logistics-related audit reports to ensure property accountability and audit trails existed for all material transactions, regardless of inventory management system used? (AFPAM 32-1004V4, para 1.5)

A1.2.5.1.5. Did the CoMA ensure post-post procedures were developed for requisition and receipt of material and personnel were trained on the proper sequence of events to follow to implement such procedures? (AFPAM 32-1004V4, para 1.5, Chap 12)

A1.2.5.1.6. (#) **Did the CoMA ensure adequate warehousing of all CE material and monitor CE material storage-related facilities, including proper handling, storage and issue of hazardous and flammable material? (AFPAM 32-1004V4, para 1.5, Chaps 11, 19)**

A1.2.5.1.7. Did the CoMA ensure requirements for hazardous materials obtained through BCE local sources of supply were approved by the Hazardous Material Pharmacy? (AFPAM 32-1004V4, para 1.5)

A1.2.5.1.8. (#) Did the CoMA ensure all material was inventoried at least annually, including annual review of residue assets to determine if turn-in was warranted and material to be retained beyond 365 days was adequately justified? (AFPAM 32-1004V4, para 1.5, Chap 7)

A1.2.5.1.9. (#) Did the CoMA/unit ensure the proper control and management of residual material? (AFPAM 32-1004V4, Chap 9)

A1.2.5.1.9.1. Did the CoMA establish a system to minimize accumulation and maximize the use of residual material? (AFPAM 32-1004V4, para 1.5)

A1.2.5.1.9.2. Do the craftsmen and planners use residual material as the first source of supply for item requirements? (AFPAM 32-1004V4, Chap 9)

A1.2.5.1.10. For projects and activities, did personnel generate the appropriate receiving records, update due-in files, and produce material receipt transactions for all in-coming items? (AFPAM 32-1004V4, para 2.2)

A1.2.5.2. Vehicle Management (AFI 24-301, AFPAM 32-1004V4, Chap 20)

A1.2.5.2.1. (#) Was the CE vehicle fleet effectively managed and was the VNCO actively involved in working vehicle issues for the unit through the LGT/Wing fleet manager? (AFI 24-301)

A1.2.5.2.2. Were only qualified and properly licensed operators permitted to operate and maintain powered vehicles and equipment? (AFI 24-301)

A1.2.5.2.3. Was a program established to replace non-Registered Equipment Management System equipment based on age and/or condition? (AFI 24-301)

A1.2.5.2.4. Was the motor scooter fleet effectively controlled and managed? (AFI 24-301)

A1.2.5.2.5. (#) Were policies established to inspect/operate vehicles and scooters as required? (AFI 24-301)?

A1.2.5.2.6. Did the VCO/VNCO conduct detailed operator care inspections using the appropriate guide and trouble report, of no less than 10 percent of unit assigned vehicles each month? (AFI 24-301, PACAF Sup 1)

A1.2.6. Maintenance Engineering Element (AFPAM 32-1004V2)

A1.2.6.1. Providing Engineering Expertise for Shops (AFPAM 32-1004V2)

A1.2.6.1.1. Did Program Engineers meet regularly with shop craftsmen to review or discuss work orders/projects in design or under construction? (AFPAM 32-1004V2 chap 2)

A1.2.6.1.2. (#) Were Program Engineers involved in work order evaluation and validation? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, chap 2)

A1.2.6.1.3. (#) Did Program Engineers ensure work orders did not duplicate/negate work already planned? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, chap 2)

A1.2.6.2. Project Review (AFPAM 32-1004V2)

A1.2.6.2.1. (#) Did Program Engineers and senior shop personnel/craftsmen perform Engineering project design reviews? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, chap 3)

A1.2.6.2.2. Were SABER contracts reviewed to ensure they were complimentary with CE operations, long-range plans, and engineering projects? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, para 3.1)

A1.2.6.2.3. (#) Did Program Engineers ensure maintainability and reliability of proposed systems during design reviews? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, chap 3)

A1.2.6.2.4. Did the Maintenance Engineer or Program Engineer sign-off on project design drawings? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, Chap 3)

A1.2.6.3. Infrastructure Programs and Management (AFPAM 32-1004V2, Chaps 4, 5, and 6)

A1.2.6.3.1. (#) Did the Maintenance Engineer or Program Engineer maintain an inventory (database or color-coded map) of major infrastructure components (airfield lighting, HVAC/R systems, electrical distribution systems, generators, roofs, pavements, water/waste-water systems, POL systems, etc) and pertinent component information? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, chap 4)

A1.2.6.3.2. Did Program Engineers and senior craftsmen conduct rating assessments of major infrastructure components to help develop programs (RWP, DSW, engineering projects, etc.)? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, chap 4)

A1.2.6.3.3. (#) Were as-built drawings being updated for all work that created changes to facilities or utility systems? (AFI 32-1001, 11.1, AFPAM 32-1004V2, Chap 6)

A1.2.6.3.4. (#) Did the Mechanical Maintenance Engineer maintain a current long-range heating, ventilation, air conditioning, and refrigeration (HVAC/R) maintenance and repair (M&R) plan? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, para 4.2.5, 5.2.1)

A1.2.6.3.4.1. Were M&R requirements identified as projects for accomplishment in the current and/or future fiscal year O&M programs? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, para 4.2.5, 5.2.1)

A1.2.6.3.4.2. Did the Mechanical Maintenance Engineer establish and conduct joint quarterly M&R Plan review with HVAC/R shop representatives? (HQ PACAF/CE Infrastructure Assessment Guidance Recommendation)

A1.2.6.3.5. Refrigerant Management

A1.2.6.3.5.1. (#) Did the unit refrigerant manager maintain a current refrigerant management plan? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, para 5.2.2, AFI 32-7080, para 3.1)

A1.2.6.3.5.1.1. Did the plan encompass all base equipment and did it project adequate supplies to meet mission needs until CFC and HCFC-using equipment had either been

replaced or reached their full economic lives? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, Ch 5, AFI 32-7080, para 3.1)

A1.2.6.3.5.2. Were all M&R requirements identified as projects for accomplishment in the current and/or fiscal year O&M programs (AFPAM 32-1004V2, Ch 4)

A1.2.6.3.6. Pavements Management Program (AFPAM 32-1004V2, chap 4)

A1.2.6.3.6.1. Was the Facility Investment Metric (FIM) (or other approved rating criteria) used to establish priorities for work/projects? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, chap 4)

A1.2.6.3.6.2. Were identified paving deficiencies developed into program activities (RWP, work orders, projects, etc.)? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, paras 4.2.3 and 5.1.1)

A1.2.6.3.6.3. (#) Was a long-range plan developed for pavements? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, para 4.2.5)

A1.2.6.3.6.4. (#) Were airfield pavements assessed periodically and were requirements jointly developed by the pavement program engineer, Heavy Repair Horizontal Shop, and the airfield manager? (AFPAM 32-1004v1, para 6.2, AFPAM 32-1004V2, para 4.2.2 and 4.2.3, AFI 13-213, para 2.3.1)

A1.2.6.3.7. Roof Management Program

A1.2.6.3.7.1. (#) Were roof surveys accomplished IAW AFI 32-1051?

A1.2.6.3.7.1.1. Did the database contain information such as facility number, warranty expiration/contractor information, square footage, user, condition code, age, type, and slope for all facilities on base? (AFI 32-1051)

A1.2.6.3.7.1.2. Did the unit maintain inspection records, accurate roof plans, historical data, and warranty information? (AFI 32-1051)

A1.2.6.3.7.2. (#) **Had a long-range plan been developed and maintained, and were roofing requirements programmed in accordance with these plans? (AFI 32-1051)**

A1.2.6.3.8. Corrosion Control Program

A1.2.6.3.8.1. (#) Was corrosion control (cathodic protection, industrial water treatment and protective coatings) provided on all projects, with the design provided by/reviewed by a qualified corrosion control engineer? (AFI 32-1054, paras 3.3, 3.4)

A1.2.6.3.8.2. Were appropriately trained personnel assigned to manage and execute the base's cathodic protection, industrial water treatment and protective coatings programs? (AFI 32-1054, para 3.5.1)

A1.2.6.3.8.3. Did the unit publish an operating instruction that outlined roles and responsibilities and stated functional requirements for the corrosion control program? (AFI 32-1054, para 3.5.2.)

A1.2.6.3.8.4. Were the shop technicians directly responsible for executing cathodic protection, industrial water treatment and protective coatings work receiving annual corrosion control training? (AFI 32-1054, para 3.5.2)

A1.2.6.3.8.5. Was a base corrosion engineer assigned and was he/she reviewing and signing-off on all project design drawings? (AFI 32-1054, para 3.5.3)

A1.2.6.3.8.6. Was the base corrosion engineer reviewing shop industrial water treatment and cathodic protection maintenance logs, identifying problems and initiating corrective actions? (AFI 32-1054, paras 3.5.1, 3.5.2, and 3.5.3)

A1.2.6.3.8.7. (#) Was cathodic protection installed on all buried or submerged POL systems and inside all potable water storage tanks? (AFI 32-1054, paras 4.3.9 and 4.3.10)

A1.2.6.3.8.8. (#) Was industrial water treatment performed on all HVAC systems (heating systems, air conditioning systems, cooling towers, generator engine radiators, etc.) using water, steam or glycol as the heat transfer medium? (AFI 32-1054, paras 4.4.5, 4.4.6, and 4.4.7)

A1.2.6.3.8.9. Were the appropriate shops maintaining corrosion logs and forwarding copies to the base corrosion control engineer? (AFI 32-1054, para 5)

A1.2.6.3.8.10. Was a Cathodic Protection Performance Booklet prepared and submitted to the PACAF Corrosion Engineer (HQ PACAF/CECI) annually? (AFI 32-1054, para 5.1.4)

A1.2.6.3.8.11. (#) Was the Cathodic Protection System portion of the Infrastructure Plan, developed and maintained? (AFI 32-7062, Atch 6)

A1.2.6.3.9. Facility Painting Program

A1.2.6.3.9.1. (#) Were facility painting records being kept and did the Maintenance Engineer maintain a long-range (five-year) facilities paint plan? (AFI 32-1054, para 5.3; MIL HDBK 1110/1)

A1.2.6.3.9.1.1. Did the plan contain pertinent information such as facility number, user, year coating applied, type of coating, type(s) of surface(s), inspection results and condition, and planned period for application of next coating, among others? (AFI 32-1054, para 5.3; MIL HDBK 1110/1)

A1.2.6.4. Energy Conservation and Management Program

A1.2.6.4.1. (#) Were properly trained personnel assigned to manage and execute the base energy management program? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, para 5.4.1)

A1.2.6.4.2. Did the energy manager hold periodic energy management steering group meetings? (AFEPPM 96-1, para 4.5)

A1.2.6.4.3. Did the energy manager have programs in place to educate personnel and publicize the energy conservation program? (AFEPPM 96-1, para 6)

A1.2.6.4.4. Were Utility Sales Agreements used in the sale of utilities to reimbursable customers? (AFI 32-1061, para 3.1)

A1.2.6.4.5. Did the utility engineer calculate reimbursable utility rates using published procedures? (AFI 32-1061, para 3.8)

A1.2.6.5. Traffic Management Program

A1.2.6.5.1. Did traffic signs/pavement markings follow AFPAM 32-1097 and/or DoT's Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, chap 5)

A1.2.6.6. Non-design Drafting Support (AFPAM 32-1004V2)

A1.2.6.6.1. Did Engineering personnel assigned to Maintenance Engineering update as-built drawings and Base General Plan tabs (unless performed by CEC or other responsible office)? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, chap 6)

A1.2.6.7. Service, Utility and IDIQ Contract Management (AFPAM 32-1004V2, Chap 7)

A1.2.6.7.1. (#) Were service contract Statements of Work (or Performance Work Statements) written to Performance-Based standards (AFI 63-124, sections 2 and 3; AFPAM 32-1006, chap 3)?

A1.2.6.7.2. (#) Did all Quality Assurance Evaluators (QAEs) receive Phase I and Phase II training? (AFI 63-124, para 4.2; AFPAM 32-1006, para 6.5)

A1.2.6.7.3. (#) Did the unit ensure timely reporting of less than satisfactory contractor service to the contracting officer? (AFI 63-124, para 1.2.8.2)

A1.2.6.7.4. Did the unit ensure the contract surveillance program followed procedures outlined in the QASP? (AFPAM 32-1006, para 6.6)

A1.2.6.7.5. Did QAE's or program managers validate actual requirements in order to minimize costs? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, chap 7)

A1.2.6.7.6. Were IDIQ contracts used to help resolve infrastructure problems (pavements, facility painting, fences, roofs etc)? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, chap 7)

A1.2.6.8. Recurring Work Program (AFPAM 32-1004V2, Chap 1 & 8)

A1.2.6.8.1. (#) Did the Maintenance Engineering element develop the overall RWP and lead the annual assessment of the RWP? (AFI 32-1001, para 10, AFPAM 32-1004V2, Ch8)

A1.2.6.8.2. Did Program Engineers (or Maintenance Engineer) accomplish economic analyses of the various RWPs? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, chap 8)

A1.2.6.9. Work Analysis and Methods Improvement (AFPAM 32-1004V2)

A1.2.6.9.1. Did the Maintenance Engineer, Ops Flight Chief, and element superintendents develop a rotation plan for junior shop personnel in order to broaden their experience? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, chap 9)

A1.2.6.9.2. Did maintenance engineers participate in Post Occupancy Inspections, and did they ensure applicable "lessons learned" were generated and properly disseminated? (AFI 32-1023, para 6.15)

A1.2.6.10. Was there a seismic management program, if applicable? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, chap 5; AFI 32-1050(I))

A1.2.7. Heavy Repair Element (AFPAM 32-1004V6)

A1.2.7.1. Scheduling

A1.2.7.1.1. Were scheduling meetings held prior to final preparation and approval of AF Form 561 to identify carry-over work, review new work, resolve problems and determine interface on multiple shop jobs?

A1.2.7.1.2. Did the proper personnel attend the scheduling meetings to ensure that resource and scheduling problems were resolved?

A1.2.7.1.3. (#) Were work orders properly classified? (AFI 32-1001, para 8)

A1.2.7.1.4. Were shop folders sent to foreman to check material received, and validation of work required?

A1.2.7.1.5. (#) Was the customer being contacted to establish an estimated start date of work?

A1.2.7.1.6. Were schedule deviations and reason documented on AF Form 561?

A1.2.7.2. Horizontal Construction (AFPAM 32-1004V6)

A1.2.7.2.1. Did technicians review work to identify hazards and perform the job safely?

A1.2.7.2.2. Were crane operators certified and did they possess an AF Form 483, certificate of competency (Note: certification can be accomplished using in-house training/certification)? (AFOSH Standard 91-46, para 8.2.4)

A1.2.7.2.3. Were annual inspections being conducted on underground drainage systems, base streets and airfield pavements?

A1.2.7.2.4. Did the shop maintain current maps of all underground drainage systems and ensure as-builts were updated at the completion of any work?

A1.2.7.2.5. (#) Did the section have required safety equipment to accomplish daily tasks? (AFOSH STD 91-10, 91-31)

A1.2.7.2.6. Were employees appropriately trained to handle hazardous materials such as Portland cement asphalt, sealant and cleaners?

A1.2.7.2.7. (#) Did the base have a Snow and Ice Plan (if applicable) (AFI 32-1002, Chapter 1)?

A1.2.7.2.7.1. Did the base have approval to utilize the current chemical stock for de-icing? (AFI 32-1002)

A1.2.7.3. Vertical Construction (AFPAM 32-1004V6)

A1.2.7.3.1. Did the shop supervisor ensure the accuracy of material requirements before work packages were ordered?

A1.2.7.3.2. Was adequate emphasis placed on the explosive actuated fastening tool programs? (AFM 91-201, para 2.2 & 2.3; AFOSHSTD 91-10, Chap 2 and 3)

A1.2.7.3.2.1. Were craftsman certified by an authorized certification agency? (AFM 91-201)

A1.2.7.3.3. Were materials reviewed for accuracy, once work orders became material complete?

A1.2.7.3.4. Was the equipment custodian's CA/CRL file established and maintained?

A1.2.7.3.5. Did the custodian conduct a periodic inventory of all equipment on the account?

A1.2.7.4. Pest Management (AFPAM 32-1004V6)

A1.2.7.4.1. (#) Was the Integrated Pest Management Plan current and complete? (AFI 32-1053)

A1.2.7.4.2. (#) Were all pesticide application personnel, to include golf course operations and contractors, properly certified, and were all new personnel certified within 2 years of initial employment? (DoDI 4150.7)

A1.2.7.4.3. (#) Were all pesticide applications recorded and reported using DD Form 1532 and 1532-1, "Pest Management Maintenance Record," or a computer-generated equivalent to include pest management, self-help, contractors, and golf course operations? (AFI 32-1053)

A1.2.7.4.4. Were only ready-to-use herbicide formulations, 24 ounces or less in volume and contained in hand-pump applicator bottles, issued through the self-help store? (DoDI 4150.7)

A1.2.7.4.5. Were self-help personnel providing written instructions and appropriate precautions (beyond those on pesticide labels) to housing occupants? (DoDI 4150.7)

A1.2.7.4.6. Were records maintained on pesticides issued to customers through self-help? (DoDI 4150.7)

A1.2.7.4.7. (#) Had all personnel received a baseline physical exam prior to potential occupational exposure to pesticides and had they received periodic occupational health exams? (AFI 32-1053)

A1.2.7.4.8. (#) Did all personnel who handled pesticides wear an approved respiratory device appropriate for protection against the pesticide applied? (DoDI 4145.19-R-1)

A1.2.7.4.9. Were vehicles equipped with locking compartments for safe handling, storage, and transport of pesticides? (AFI 32-1053)

A1.2.7.4.10. Did pest control vehicles carry emergency phone numbers and an appropriate spill cleanup kit? (AFI 32-1053)

A1.2.7.4.11. Did all prime movers used for fogging, misting, dusting, and ultra-low volume application had enclosed cabs and internal recycling air-conditioners (to protect the operator from excessive pesticide exposure)? (AFI 32-1053)

A1.2.7.4.12. (#) Did all personnel who mixed and applied pesticides utilize the appropriate protective clothing and equipment? (AFI 32-1053; AFOSHSTD 91-31)

A1.2.7.4.13. Did personnel obtain required respirator training and respirator fit testing? (AFI 32-1053)

A1.2.7.4.14. Was all pesticide application/dispersal equipment maintained in the BCE Environmental Controls section (EXCEPTION: Equipment at base golf courses that had certified pesticide applicators)? (AFI 32-1053)

A1.2.7.4.15. Was there a sign at the entrance(s) to the latrine that states, "WASH HANDS BEFORE USING TOILET?" (Technical Information Memorandum (TIM) 17)

A1.2.7.4.16. Was there a sign placed at the entrance to the mixing area that states, "VENTILATION SYSTEM SHOULD OPERATE CONTINUOUSLY. DO NOT ENTER UNLESS VENTILATION SYSTEM HAS OPERATED FOR AT LEAST TEN MINUTES?" (TIM 17)

A1.2.7.4.17. Did the sink had a sign posted that states, "DO NOT DISCHARGE PESTICIDE OR PESTICIDE SOLUTIONS IN THE SINK?" (TIM 17)

A1.2.7.4.18. Was the pest management facility enclosed within a climb-resistant chain link fence to prevent unauthorized entry? (TIM 17)

A1.2.7.4.19. (#) Were Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS's) for all pesticides/agents available for review by pest management personnel? (TIM 18)

A1.2.7.4.20. (#) Were pesticide labels readily available (for quick reference) for every pesticide on-hand? (TIM 18)

A1.2.7.4.21. Was a current inventory of pesticides maintained and was a copy provided to the installation fire department? (TIM 18)

A1.3. RESOURCES FLIGHT

A1.3.1. Manpower Management

A1.3.1.1. Did the unit manage its manpower matters to include advising the commander and workcenter supervisors on manpower standards application, variances, and authorization change requests? (AFI 38-201, Chap 2)

A1.3.1.2. Did the unit maintain, update, and track status of applicable changes to the Unit Manning Document (UMD), Unit Manpower Requirements (UMPR) document, authorization change requests (ACR), authorization change notices (ACN), and organizational change requests (OCRs)? (AFI 38-201, Chap 2)

A1.3.1.3. Did the UMD accurately reflect Contract Manpower Equivalent (CME) positions for contracts, and did the positions reside in the functional area where the work would be performed if the operation were in-house? (AFI 38-201, Chap 6)

A1.3.2. Financial Management

A1.3.2.1. (#) Did the financial manager develop a comprehensive, valid and executable CE O&M, 3080, and MFH budget for submission to the wing budget office for inclusion in the wing financial plan? (DFAS-DE 7000.1-R; DoDI 4000.19; AFI 65-601V2)

A1.3.2.2. (#) Did the financial manager examine available financial reports to determine actual obligations and to correct accounting errors and ensure 80 percent of the O&M appropriation was obligated by 31 July of each fiscal year? (DoDI 4000.19; AFI 65-601V1 and V2)

A1.3.2.3. (#) Did the financial manager ensure the reimbursable/refund program was in-place and closely monitor shop rates, labor reporting and the assignment of reimbursement/refund indicator codes? (AFI 65-601V1, Chap 7)

A1.3.2.4. Did the financial manager assist in the computation, verification and coordination of all host tenant and inter-service support agreements? (AFI 25-201, para 2.4; DoDI 4000.19, para 4.6)

A1.3.2.5. Did the financial manager review and edit the reimbursement and refunds in the cost accounting system for accuracy prior to forwarding to the AFO? (AFI 65-601V1, Chap 5)

A1.3.2.6. (#) Did the financial manager ensure all MFH costs were properly expensed and statutory limitations (expenses related to improvement, maintenance and repair, minor

alterations, and furnishings for GOQs, and expenses related to improvement, maintenance and repair, minor alterations, and self-help work for non-GOQs) were not exceeded? (DoDI 4000.19; AFI 65-601V1, Chap 21; AFI 32-6003, para 2.5; AFI 32-6002, Chap 1)

A1.3.2.7. Did the financial manager ensure that management control program evaluations were completely and accurately performed in order to support the year-end statement? (AFI 65-201, para 1.8)

A1.3.3. Government Wide Purchase Card (GWPC)

A1.3.3.1. Did the unit send proper written requests designating proposed cardholders and approving officials? (AFI 64-117, para 3.1)

A1.3.3.2. (#) (Validate by sampling cardholders) Were only authorized purchases made with the GWPC? (AFI 64-117, para 2.1)

A1.3.3.3. (#) Had each cardholder limited purchases to transactions under his or her single purchase limit? (AFI 64-117, para 3.2.1)

A1.3.3.4. (#) Did the total value of the cardholder's purchase for any single month exceed the monthly cardholder limit established by the approving official? (AFI 64-117, para 3.1)

A1.3.4. Real Estate Management

A1.3.4.1. Was the Transfer of Accountability Certificate documenting the transfer of real property accountability to the current accountable officer on file? (AFI 32-9005, para 2.7 & atch 2)

A1.3.4.1.1. Was the Special Order appointing the real property accountable officer a part of the accountable records? (DoDI 4165.14; AFI 32-9005, para 2.4)

A1.3.4.2. Had the Real Property officer ensured a progressive physical inventory of all real property was scheduled to ensure that a complete inventory was completed at least every 5 years? (AFI 32-9005, para 5.1)

A1.3.4.3. Did the unit document annual compliance inspections of all Air Force real property being temporarily used by others (outgrants)? (AFI 32-9003, chap 1)

A1.3.4.3.1. When real property was leased or licensed for commercial use, were unsatisfactory compliance inspections reported to HQ PACAF/CEPRE or the Corps of Engineers (depending upon who has control over the outgrant)? (AFI 32-9003, para 1.6.2)

A1.3.4.4. (#) Did the unit perform and document annual utilization surveys to identify property not used, underutilized, or not put to optimum use? (DoDD 4165.6; AFI 32-9002, para 1.2)

A1.3.4.4.1. Were the results reported to the installation commander or his designated representative? (AFI 32-9002, para 1.2)

A1.3.4.5. Was the installation boundary inspected annually to ensure there were no encroachments by fences, new buildings, roads, etc.? (DoDI 4165.14; AFI 32-9005, para 5.3)

A1.3.4.5.1. Was unauthorized occupancy reported to MAJCOM? (AFI 32-9005, chap 5, para 5.3)

A1.3.4.6. Were outgrants properly suspensed so that real estate outgrant instruments requiring renewal were identified for action 9 months prior to expiration? (DoDD 4165.6, AFI 32-9003, para 1.6.4)

A1.3.4.7. Were DD Form 1354s, Transfer and Acceptance of Military Real Property, accurately completed for construction activities/real property transfers? (AFI 32-9005, para 3.2 through 3.5)

A1.3.4.8. (#) Were changes affecting real property records promptly and accurately annotated, and was all new construction accurately capitalized? (AFI 32-9005, chap 4)

A1.4. ENVIRONMENTAL FLIGHT

A1.4.1. Flight Management

A1.4.1.1. Was the environmental flight included in work requirements planning to ensure environmental concerns were properly addressed? (AFI 32-1001, para 6; AFI 32-7061, para 1.3.4 and 3.1; AFI 32-1032, para 3.5)

A1.4.1.2. (#) Did the Environmental Protection Committee (EPC) or Environmental, Safety, Occupational Health Committee (ESOHC) provide an effective cross-functional medium to address the wing's environmental issues in all four environmental pillars? (AFI 32-7005, para 3.3, 4.1, 4.3)

A1.4.1.3. Did the Environmental Status of Resources and Training System (ESORTS) rating provide an accurate and timely evaluation of the installations environmental status? (AFI 32-7005, PACAF Sup 1)

A1.4.1.3.1. Did the unit submit current and past ESORTS reports (RCS: PAF-CEV(Q)9101) validated by the EPC or ESOHC to HQ PACAF/CEV in a timely manner? (AFI 32-7005, Sup 1, para 4.3.1.1)

A1.4.2. Environmental Restoration (US Regulated Installations and Territories)

A1.4.2.1. (#) Had a Management Action Plan (MAP) been prepared and kept updated? (AFI 32-7020, para 3.3; HQ USAF/CEV memo, 15 Apr 92)

A1.4.2.2. Did the installation implement peer review recommendations unless written justification was provided for not implementing the recommendation? (AFI 32-7020, para 4.2)

A1.4.2.3. Did the installation implement projects according to the scopes identified in validated programming documents? (HQ PACAF Guidance on Environmental Restoration Account Project Documentation, Mar 01)

A1.4.2.4. Did the installation adhere to the principles and recommendations of the Federal Facilities Environmental Restoration Dialogue Committee? (DUSDS/US EPA Memo, Restoration Advisory Board Implementation Guidelines, 27 Sep 94, HQ PACAF ERA Guidance, Mar 01)

A1.4.3. Environmental Compliance

A1.4.3.1. (#) Did the installation execute an effective Environmental, Safety, and Occupational Health Compliance Assessment Management Program (ESOHCAMP)? (AFI 32-7045, para 1.2)

A1.4.3.2. (#) Did the EPC or ESOHC monitor the status of open ESOHCAMP assessment findings and aggressively address closure? (AFI 32-7045, para 1.3.4)

A1.4.3.2.1. Was the installation actively tracking and closing findings associated with units, tenant units and contractor activities identified in the most recent ESOHCAMP assessment? (AFI 32-7045, para 1.3.4)

A1.4.3.3. (#) Had the installation performed an internal ESOHCAMP assessment on all base properties within the past year (except in the year an external ESOHCAMP was conducted by HQ PACAF)? (AFI 32-7045, para 1.1)

A1.4.3.3.1. Did the unit complete the final report and a comprehensive MAP within the required time? (AFI 32-7045, para 3.1)

A1.4.3.4. (#) Were Open Enforcement Actions (OEA) status and corrective actions tracked and reviewed by the EPC or ESOHC? (AFI 32-7005, PACAF Sup 1)

A1.4.3.5. For overseas installations, did personnel identify applicable host-nation environmental standards, did they monitor regulatory trends, and did they maintain copies of or had access to applicable host-nation environmental documents, standards, and regulations? (DoDI 4715.5, para 5.3.2.2)

A1.4.3.6. For overseas installations, had personnel ensured that compliance requirements were funded in the current or the immediately following fiscal year if leaving them unremedied would result in one or more of the conditions outlined in the referenced Instruction? (DoDI 4715.5, para 6.5.2)

A1.4.3.7. (#) For spill sites overseas, were cleanup actions undertaken to safeguard human health and the environment in accordance with the applicable Final Governing Standards (FGS)? (Country-specific FGS)

A1.4.3.7.1. (#) **Did environmental personnel maintain required information on spill or accident sites? (Country–specific FGS)**

A1.4.3.7.2. (#) For environmental remediation for DoD activities overseas, did personnel obtain a determination of known or imminent and substantial endangerment and extent of remedy determination from appropriate authorities? (DoDI 4715.8, para 5.4)

A1.4.4. Pollution Prevention

A1.4.4.1. Was the installation tracking its progress towards attaining remaining USAF solid waste diversion and hazardous material use goals? (HQ USAF/CE policy ltr, Jan 99; HQ USAF/ILEV memo, Jan 00)

A1.4.4.2. (#) Was the Hazardous Material Pharmacy effectively controlling hazardous materials utilized on the installation? (AFI 32-7086, Chapter 2)

A1.4.4.2.1. Did CE personnel lead and provide required functional participants to the Hazardous Material Management Program team? (AFI 32-7086, para1.1.2.1)

A1.4.5. Conservation Resources

A1.4.5.1. For overseas installations, had the EPF established a means to determine if proposed actions or activities were Major Federal Actions? (DODD 6050.7, para 3.2 and 3.5)

A1.4.5.2. Did the EPC or ESOHC help the Commander assess, review and approve EIAP actions, including findings of no significant impact (FONSI) and wetlands and floodplain findings of no practicable alternatives (FONPAs)? (AFI 32-7061, para 1.3.6 and 3.3.7)

A1.4.5.3. Did the conservation resources office make routine use of the public affairs office for advertising required EIAP and AICUZ actions as well as to inform the base citizens and local community and conservation resource activities? (40 CFR 1500-1508, AFI 32-7061, para 4.1)

A1.4.5.4. Had installation personnel ensured implementation of the Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) and did they control access to and use of installation natural resources? (AFI 32-7064, para 1.2.7)

A1.4.5.5. Had environmental personnel ensured the Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP) was an integral part of the Base Comprehensive Plan, was reviewed/revised annually, and the updated document approved and signed by the appropriate authorities? (AFI 32-7065, para 2.2.4)

A1.4.5.6. Did installation personnel properly identify what effects projects may have on cultural resources? (AFI 32-7065, para 4.2)

A1.4.5.7. Did environmental personnel utilize the INRMP and CRMP during the normal course of planning and evaluating proposed actions or activities? (DoDI 4715.3, Enclosure 6, AFI 32-7064, para 2.1 and Atch 2, para 4, AFI 32-7065, para 2.2.1)

A1.5. HOUSING FLIGHT

A1.5.1. Flight Management

A1.5.1.1. Were family housing facilities operated and maintained to a standard that protects the facilities from deterioration and provides a safe and comfortable living environment? (DoDD 41655.63-M, chap 1, para C2)

A1.5.1.2. Was the housing flight encouraging occupants to make use of the self-help program to improve their living conditions and keep the housing unit properly maintained? (DoDD 4165.63-M, chap 1, para D6)

A1.5.1.3. Had the housing office developed an aggressive community housing and relocation program to provide counseling and assistance to members seeking community housing? (DoDD 4165.63-M, chap 2, para C; AFI 32-6001, para 1.4)

A1.5.1.4. Did the Housing Manager coordinate self-help store operations with the Operations Flight and play an active role in store operations? (AFI 32-6001, para 6.5-6.6)

A1.5.1.5. Was there a current (less than 3 years old) Housing Market Analysis (HMA) on file to support investment projects at installations? (AFI 32-6001, Chap 7)

A1.5.1.6. (#) Had the installation established appropriate guidelines and priorities for the assignment of military family housing to ensure a 98% occupancy rate was maintained? (DoDD 4165.63-M, chap 2, para E and AFI 32-6002, para 1.3.1)

A1.5.1.7. (#) Were required annual and long-range plans developed and executed for each General Officer Quarter (GOQ)? (AFI 32-6003, para 2.3-2.4)

A1.5.1.8. (#) Did the Flight establish a means to accurately track expenses related to improvement, maintenance and repair, minor alterations, and furnishings for GOQs and did they ensure applicable statutory funding limits were not exceeded? (AFI 32-6003, para 2.5, AFI 32-6002, Chap 1)

A1.5.1.9. (#) Did the Flight establish a means to accurately track expenses related to improvement, maintenance and repair, minor alterations, and self-help work for family housing units (non-GOQs) and did they ensure applicable statutory funding limits were not exceeded? (AFI 32-6002, Chap 1)

A1.5.2. Unaccompanied Housing

A1.5.2.1. (#) Did the installation establish a Quarters Improvement Committee and did the committee develop a viable Quarters Improvement Plan? (AFI 32-6005, para 1.4.1.9)

A1.5.2.2. Did the installation establish inspection standards and designate authorized inspectors for unaccompanied housing? (AFI 32-6005, para 1.4.1.12, Atch 2)

A1.5.2.3. Were dormitories being maintained in an attractive and comfortable manner, and were occupants provided the appropriate adequacy standards? (DoDD 4165.64-M, chap 5, para A)

A1.5.2.4. (#) Was the base maintaining an unaccompanied housing occupancy rate of 90% or greater? (AFI 32-6005, para 1.4.1.4)

A1.5.2.5. Was the dormitory assignment policy enacting the Air Force private room strategy in accordance with the implementation schedule? If not, were there MAJCOM waivers on file? (AFI 32-6005, chap 2, para 2.1)

A1.5.2.6. Were dormitory assignments maintaining unit integrity as long as it did not cause the base occupancy rate to fall below 90% (AFI 32-6005, chap 2, para 2.1.2.5)

A1.5.3. Furnishing and Appliance Management

A1.5.3.1. (#) Had the FMO established procedures to ensure proper accountability of government furnishings and taken measures to safeguard and protect the furnishings inventory? (DoDD 4165.63-M, chap 1, para C2; AFI 32-6004, Chap 3)

A1.5.3.2. Did the Housing Flight ensure an annual inventory of all FMO warehouse stocks was performed? (AFI 32-6004, para 1.6)

A1.5.3.3. Did the FMO establish a repair and preventive maintenance program? (AFI 32-6004, para 3.7)

A1.5.3.4. Did the FMO maintain a clear and defined audit trail of all furnishings transactions, to include maintaining all required transaction records? (AFI 32-6004, para 4.3)

A1.5.3.5. (#) Did the unit ensure an adequate level of appliances were available to meet installation needs? (AFI 32-1001, para 13, AFI 32-6004, Chap 6)

A1.5.3.6. Did the BCE and MFH personnel ensure adequate management controls and safeguards were established to preserve appliance warranties and execute prudent appliance maintenance and replacement decisions? (AFI 32-1001, para 13, AFI 32-6004, Chap 6)

A1.5.3.7. Did the FMO maintain an accurate inventory of appliances, to include year, make/model, serial number, and other identification requirements, as well as physical location? (AFI 32-6004, Chap 6)

A1.5.3.8. (#) Were furnishing and appliance storage, material handling, housekeeping and safety requirements met? (AFI 32-6004, para 3.1-3.2)

A1.6. FIRE PROTECTION FLIGHT

A1.6.1. (#) Had the fire chief established and implemented an effective fire protection and prevention program? (DoDI 6055.6 para E; AFPD 32-20, para 1.3.4; AFI 32-2001, para 2.3)

A1.6.1.1. (#) Were Fire Risk Management Plans and operational policies addressed properly when resources and staffing levels fell below Air Force standards? (AFI 32-2001, para 2.3.1)

A1.6.1.2. (#) Were ORM plans accomplished when the fire department failed to comply with DoD and Air Force Instructions, OSHA regulations, and NFPA Standards, and did the Installation Commander approve ORM plans? (AFI 32-2001, para 2.3.2)

A1.6.1.3. (#) Was the Fire fighter occupational safety and health program properly addressed? (AFI 32-2001, para 2.3.3)

A1.6.1.4. (#) Were procedures to ensure environmental pollution control during all fire protection activities properly addressed? (AFI 32-2001, para 2.3.4)

A1.6.1.5. (#) Did the fire department have procedures to ensure adequate command and control, rescue, extinguishments, and containment actions based on the conditions present during a Hazardous Materials incident? (AFI 32-2001, para 2.3.5)

A1.6.1.6. (#) Did the flight have procedures to respond to incidents occurring in rough and difficult terrain and off-installation Airfield Installation Compatibility Use Zone (AICUZ) areas? (AFI 32-2001, para 2.3.6)

A1.6.1.7. (#) Did the flight had selective response procedures to reduce the number of aircraft rescue and fire fighting vehicles responding to an emergency when appropriate? (AFI 32-2001, para 2.3.7)

A1.6.1.8. (#) Had the flight established a confined space program? (AFI 32-2001, para 2.3.8; AFOSHSTD 91-25)

A1.6.1.9. (#)Had the flight established an emergency medical response program? (AFI 32-2001, para 2.3.9)

A1.6.1.10. (#)Had the flight established procedures for off-installation responses? (AFI 32-2001, para 2.3.10)

A1.6.2. Were all deviations to DoDI 6055.6, AFPD 32-20, AFMAN 32-2003, OSHA regulations, NFPA standards, and AFI 32-2001, submitted to HQ PACAF/CEXOF in the form of ORM plans that fully address the non-compliant situations? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.1.1)

A1.6.2.1. Had the fire chief ensured the installation commander was fully informed of the fire department's capabilities and did the fire chief establish standard operating procedures on incident response priorities that were approved by the installation commander? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.1.2)

A1.6.2.2. Had the fire chief determined staffing requirements when the tower is not operational due to no flying, and combined requirements with no aircraft ground servicing or maintenance? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.1.2.1)

A1.6.2.3. Had the flight entered a Memorandum of Agreement with civilian community to offset internal levels of fire protection staffing and equipage, coordinated with the HQ PACAF/CEXOF, and complied with AFI 10-802, *Military Support to Civil Authorities*? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.1.2.2)

A1.6.2.4. Had the fire chief determined when additional duties or details impact mission support or acceptable levels of risk and advise the base civil engineer and installation commander? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.1.2.3)

A1.6.2.5. Were all inspections of firefighting support equipment not assigned to vehicles recorded on AF Form 1071, Inspection and Maintenance Record or an approved automated product? (AFI 32-2001, Para 3.1.3)

A1.6.2.6. Had the flight ensured investigations of fire incidents were in accordance with AFI 91-204, *Safety Investigations and Reports*? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.1.5)

A1.6.2.7. Did the flight report emergency responses in accordance with the automated DoD Fire Incident Reporting System (DFIRS) and Attachment 3 of AFI 32-2001? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.1.6)

A1.6.2.8. (#) Had Mutual Aid Agreements been accomplished in accordance with Attachment 4 (US) and Attachment 5 (Foreign) of AFI 32-2001, and if the fire department will provide firefighting services at joint-use civilian airports, included a release and indemnification clause IAW Attachment 6 of AFI 32-2001? (32-2001, para 3.1.7)

A1.6.2.8.1. Had the Installation Commander approved the Mutual Aid Agreements? (32-2001, para 3.1.7)

A1.6.2.8.2. Had the fire chief and their assistants coordinated with local agencies to familiarize each other with the incident management system and at what level local agencies comply with NFPA 1500? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.1.7.1)

A1.6.2.8.3. Had the fire department conducted annual surveys for those areas surrounding the base where they may be called upon to provide mutual aid or assistance, and obtained copies of civilian fire department emergency response plans for high hazard areas where they may be requested to provide assistance? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.1.7.2)

A1.6.2.9. (#) Had the Fire Chief established and managed the Firefighter Certification Program to include all military AFSC 3E7XX, civilian GS-081, local national, and contractor-operated fire department members certified by the DoD Fire and Emergency Services Certification Program in accordance with DoD 6055.6-M, AFMAN 32-2003, AFI 32-4002, and the CerTest Computer-Based Testing Procedural Guide? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.2)

A1.6.2.9.1. Did all fire fighters meet proficiency training requirements stated in attachment 2 of AFI 32-2001? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.2)

A1.6.2.10. Did the fire department have a “live” crash fire training facility and operate it in accordance with T.O. 35E1-2-13-1, *Operations and Maintenance Instructions Crash Fire Rescue Training Facility*? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.2.1)

A1.6.2.11. Did the fire department have a “live” fire structural training facility and did the facility meet the design requirements of NFPA 1001, *Fire fighter Professional Qualifications*? (AFI 32-2001, para 3-2.1)

A1.6.2.12. Did all fire department members participate in the HQ USAF Surgeon General approved DoD fitness/wellness program? (32-2001, Para 3.2.2)

A1.6.2.13. Had the fire chief determined the fire department members be trained to at least the Emergency Medical Technician - Basic (EMT-B) level? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.2.3)

A1.6.2.14. (#) Had the Fire Chief, Assistant Chief for Operations, Readiness and Logistics, Assistant Chief for Operations, Assistant Chief for Training, and other designated senior fire officials attended the On-Scene Commanders Course as specified in AFI 32-4002? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.2.4)

A1.6.3. (#) Did the fire department use NFPA 1561 and the National Fire Academy Incident Command System (ICS) as their ICS? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.3.1)

A1.6.3.1. Had the fire chief determined and developed pre-fire plans for high fire-and life-risk facilities, hazardous operations and assigned/transient aircraft? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.3.2)

A1.6.3.2. Had the fire chief established rescue teams for each shift, and was each member of the rescue team a graduate of or scheduled to attend the AETC or USAFE Firefighter Rescue Course and DoD-certified at the Firefighter II and airport firefighter levels? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.3.3)

A1.6.3.3. (#) Did the fire department provide initial medical response, and if so, had the fire chief developed emergency care protocols approved by the medical care facility Commander? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.3.4)

A1.6.3.4. (#) Had the fire chief established a firefighter occupation, safety, and health program and fully implemented NFPA 1500 as a minimum?

A1.6.3.4.1. (#) Was the program fully integrated into the installation's Air Force Occupational Safety and Health (AFOSH) and MAJCOM Environmental, Occupational Safety and Health (EOSH) programs?

A1.6.3.4.2. (#) Did the fire chief complete and forward the NFPA 1500, Appendix B, to HQ PACAF/CEXOF each year by 1 September?

A1.6.3.4.3. (#) Did Worksheet submission include an approved ORM plan for all non-compliant areas? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.3.5)

A1.6.3.5. During an emergency, when the situation dictated, did the senior fire official on-scene assign an incident safety officer? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.3.6)

A1.6.3.6. Did the fire department have the capability to respond ARFF vehicles to any incident on the runways or overruns within one minute after pre-positioning for a pre-announced emergency; for unannounced emergencies, did at least one primary ARFF vehicle reach the end of the furthest runway within three minutes from the time of dispatch from the airfield fire station; did the remaining vehicles, for both announced and unannounced emergencies, reach staging locations at intervals not exceeding 30 seconds after the arrival of the initial vehicle? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.3.7)

A1.6.3.7. Did the fire department meet the Facility Response Requirements as outlined in DoDI 6055.6? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.3.8)

A1.6.3.8. Had the fire department developed a policy when responding to off-base emergencies, including mutual aid emergencies (where the senior Air force fire official will employ an Air Force firefighter to perform as the safety officer to observe the Air Force portions of the operation)? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.3.9)

A1.6.3.9. (#) Had the fire chief ensured the proper Force Activity Designator (FAD) codes for fire protection vehicles, equipment, and supplies were equal to the mission being supported? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.3.10)

A1.6.3.9.1. (#) Was fire pump testing, maintenance, and annual certifications recorded on AF Form 1078, Fire Truck and equipment Test Inspection Record, or automated product? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.3.10)

A1.6.3.10. Did the fire department maintain a reserve quantity of AFFF and dry chemical firefighting agents equal to the total capacity of assigned firefighting vehicles at the fire station and at the Base Logistics Center? (The fire chief will maintain a secondary reserve of AFFF when the Base Logistics Center did not maintain; this did not include Dry Chemical)? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.3.11)

A1.6.3.11. Had the installation commander determined which agencies were authorized transceiver access to the fire crash net and were two frequencies dedicated to the fire department? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.3.12)

A1.6.3.12. Did all fire stations had automatic start/transfer emergency generator backup power? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.3.12)

A1.6.3.13. Was the FACC staffed with qualified personnel and equipped to provide 24-hour emergency services and routine communications services? (DoDI 6055.6, para 8d(1))

A1.6.3.14. Did the fire chief or assistance fire chief on duty receive at least a 30-minute prior notification when exercises involved fire fighting vehicles, equipment, or personnel? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.3.13)

A1.6.4. Had the fire department established a Fire Prevention program IAW AFI 91-301, *Air Force Occupational Environmental Safety, Fire Protection*, and Health Program IAW AFOSH STD 91-56, *Fire Protection and Prevention*? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.4)

A1.6.4.1. Did the fire prevention section conduct annual facility fire prevention assessments, unless required more often by public law or other statutory requirement? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.4.2)

A1.6.4.2. Was AF Form 218, **Facility Fire Prevention and Protection Record** used as a checklist and to record the results of facility assessments? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.4.3)

A1.6.4.3. Was AF Form 1487, **Fire Prevention Visit Report** used to identify the condition of the fire prevention program to commanders? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.4.4)

A1.6.4.4. Did fire prevention personnel evaluate fire hazard reports and coordinate actions with ground safety personnel? (AFI 91-301, para 2.12.3)

A1.6.4.4.1. Did the fire department provide a representative to the Occupational Safety and Health Council (or base equivalent)? (AFI 91-301, para 14.1.2)

A1.6.5. Did fire protection personnel coordinate with the appropriate civil engineer shop to ensure inspection, testing, repair, and maintenance of fire detection, water distribution, and suppression systems was performed? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.5)

A1.6.5.1. When fire protection systems were impaired and out-of-service, to include water distribution systems, did the appropriate civil engineer shop immediately notify the Fire Alarm Communication Center (FACC)? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.6)

A1.6.5.2. Were all tests on water distribution systems recorded on AF Form 1027, Water Flow Test Record, and a copy provided to the fire chief? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.6)

A1.6.6. Did the fire chief coordinate on design drawings to signify review and ensure fire fighting operational recommendations were incorporated? (AFI 32-2001, para 3.7)

A1.6.7. Was a Hazardous Materials (HAZMAT) response program in place and functioning in accordance with NFPA 472? (AFPD 32-20, para 1.2.3, 1.2.4)

A1.6.8. (#) Was the flight prepared to adapt to, and function in, a wartime environment? (DoDI 6055.6, para E.4.d, AFI 32-4001)

A1.7. EOD FLIGHT

A1.7.1. (#) Were EOD services provided to all base units, tenants, and other agencies within the unit's AOR and were those commanders offered a mission and capabilities briefing? (AFJI 32-3002, and PACAF Sup 1, AFI 32-3001)

A1.7.2. (#) Were personnel capable of performing three task evaluations - Flights will be required to perform three of the following task evaluations as determined by the PACAF HQ Staff and the IG; (1) conventional Ordnance Safing, (2) General Demolition/Disposal operation, (3) Peacetime Aircraft Safing exercise, (4) Improvised Explosive Device operation, (5) Broken Arrow operation, (6) Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) operation. (PACAF Sup 1, AFI 32-3001)

A1.7.3. Were operating instructions developed, coordinated, and implemented for each area designed in PACAFI 32-301 and was formal guidance established for required areas? (PACAF Sup 1, AFI 32-3001)

A1.7.4. (#) Were flight resources, including personnel, equipment, technical data, facilities, vehicles, supplies, funds and explosives, properly managed? (DoDD 5200.2-R; AFI 32-3001, PACAF Sup 1)

A1.7.4.1. Were all resource shortfalls, which degraded mission capability, identified to the BCE? (DoDD 5200.2-R; AFI 32-3001, PACAF Sup 1)

A1.7.4.2. Was all equipment maintained in a mission-ready status? (DoDD 5200.2-R; AFPD 31-5; AFPD 32-30; AFI 32-3001, PACAF Sup 1)

A1.7.4.3. Were all security and resource protection requirements being complied with? (DoDD 5200.2-R, AFPD 31-5; AFI 32-3001, PACAF Sup 1)

A1.7.4.4. Were all flight personnel capable of providing VIP support? (DoDD 5200.2-R; AFI 32-3001, PACAF Sup 1)

A1.7.5. Had supervisors attended formal task certifier and/or trainer courses and were they properly designated in writing by their commander? (AFI 36-2201)

A1.7.6. Was the flight's upgrade training (UGT) monitored and were systematic procedures in-place to track and document? (AFI 36-2201)

A1.7.7. Did supervisors ensure training records show accurate and current qualifications and training requirements? (AFI 36-2201 and 3E8XX CFETP)

A1.7.8. Was the AF EOD standard training program effectively implemented? (AFI 32-3001, PACAF Sup 1; 3E8XX CFETP)

A1.7.8.1. Were procedures established and areas available to conduct practical training? (AFI 32-3001, PACAF Sup 1; 3E8XX CFETP)

A1.7.8.2. Were all requirements for demolition pay met and documented? (AFI 32-3001, PACAF Sup 1; 3E8XX CFETP)

A1.7.8.3. Were flight personnel knowledgeable of supported munitions/aircraft? (AFI 32-3001, PACAF Sup 1; 3E8XX CFETP

A1.7.8.4. Were personnel familiar with tools and equipment? (AFI 32-3001, PACAF Sup 1; 3E8XX CFETP)

A1.7.9. Did the flight equip, maintain, account and track status of assigned UTCs and base support equipment? (AFI 32-3001 and AFI 10-201)

A1.7.9.1. (#) Were all SORTS items properly reported? (AFI 32-3001 and AFI 10-201)

A1.7.9.2. Did the flight have all equipment and supplies required by the EOD equipment and supply listing (EOD ESL) on-hand or on order? (AFI 32-3001 and AFI 10-201)

A1.7.9.3. Were all deployable kits and base support assets maintained as required? (AFI 32-3001 and AFI 10-201)

A1.7.9.4. Were explosives properly maintained and accounted/forecasted for? (AFI 32-3001 and AFI 10-201)

A1.7.10. Did the quality assurance program identify and track problems for flight management? (PACAF Sup 1 to AFI 32-3001)

A1.7.10.1. Was a method in-place to track, monitor and close discrepancies? (AFI 32-3001, PACAF Sup 1)

A1.7.10.2. Were functional area evaluations conducted semi-annually? (AFI 32-3001, PACAF Sup 1)

A1.7.10.3. Were team operations evaluated and documented as required? (AFI 32-3001, PACAF Sup 1)

A1.7.10.4. Were Quality Assurance (QA) evaluators designated in-writing and certified by the flight chief? (AFI 32-3001, PACAF Sup 1)

A1.7.11. (#) Had all EOD Flight personnel completed annual team operation evaluation requirements? (AFI 32-3001, PACAF Sup 1; applicable 60 series T.O.'s)

A1.7.11.1. (#) Did the EOD team demonstrate common criteria for all team technical evaluations being met, such as, response to incident with qualified personnel, tech data, and equipment; perform initial reconnaissance, determine location, and proper identification; possess knowledge of all hazardous and classified components involved in the operation; planning of EOD actions; use of applicable hazard detection, protective clothing, and equip-

ment; and render safe procedures, transportation to safe disposal area, and final disposal? (AFI 32-3001, PACAF Sup 1; applicable 60 series T.O.'s)

A1.7.11.2. For Conventional Munitions Operations, in addition to common criteria, can personnel demonstrate the common criteria for all team technical evaluations? (AFI 32-3001, PACAF Sup 1; applicable 60 series T.O.'s)

A1.7.11.3. For Broken Arrow Operations, in addition to common criteria, can the team demonstrate knowledge of hazards and safety precautions applicable to nuclear weapons, use of appropriate detecting and monitoring equipment, preparation of EOD portion of recovery plan, contamination control, initial packaging and marking of contaminated material and IRT procedures as defined in DOD 5200.52M?

A1.7.11.4. For Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Operations, in addition to common criteria, can personnel demonstrate diagnostic capability and interpretation, detection, remote access or entry procedures, render safe and neutralizing procedures, containment and mitigation, initial packaging and marking of material and recover procedures? (AFI 32-3001, PACAF Sup 1; EOD CONOPS on WMD; applicable 10 series AFI's and applicable 60 series T.O.'s)

A1.7.11.5. For aircraft operations, in addition to common criteria, can personnel demonstrate knowledge of hazards and safety precautions for aircraft in general and specific, identification and location of armament system components (bomb racks, pylons, guns, launchers) and non-explosive hazards, identification of explosive ordnance (bombs, rockets, missiles, flares, cartridges, egress system items) carried or installed on the aircraft, EOD procedures for gaining access to, saf-ing, and removing hazardous explosive components and munitions (NOTE: munitions were downloaded only when the specific item RSP requires this action)? (AFI 32-3001, PACAF Sup 1; applicable 60 series T.O.'s)

A1.7.11.6. For demolition range operations, in addition to common criteria, can personnel demonstrate disposal procedures according to applicable publications (the team may satisfy this requirement during either a separate evaluation or as the final disposal portion of conventional, chemical, or IED operations)? (AFI 32-3001, PACAF Sup 1; applicable 60 series T.O.'s)

A1.7.11.7. For Improvised Explosive Devices (IED) operations, in addition to common criteria, can personnel demonstrate diagnostic interpretation, remote access or entry procedures and render safe and neutralizing procedures? (AFI 32-3001, PACAF Sup 1; applicable 60 series T.O.'s)

A1.7.11.8. Had all EOD Flight functional areas completed the annual inspection requirements? (PACAF Sup 1 to AFI 32-3001; specific self-inspection guide and applicable 60 series T.O.'s)

A1.7.11.9. Were reports for the functional area inspections kept on file for a minimum of one year? (AFI 32-3001, PACAF Sup 1)

A1.7.12. Were federal, state and local environmental requirements being met during responses? (Munitions Rule; AFI 32-3001)

A1.7.12.1. Were local environmental requirements met for emergency disposal operations? (Munitions Rule; AFI 32-3001)

A1.7.12.2. Were emergency disposals of munitions only conducted on those items that pose an immediate threat to life/property in accordance with the munitions rule? (Munitions Rule; AFI 32-3001)

A1.7.12.3. Were munitions rule requirements met during off-base responses? (Munitions Rule; AFI 32-3001)

A1.7.13. Had the flight established programs and training for AFOSH requirements: Respiratory Protection, Confined Space Entry and Hazardous Material Response? (AFI 32-4002, AFOSH STD 48-1 and 91-25, 29 CFR 1910)

A1.7.13.1. Did the flight have a respiratory protection program and were all personnel fit tested for assigned breathing apparatus within 180 days of arrival on station? (AFI 32-4002, AFOSH STD 48-1 and 91-25, 29 CFR 1910)

A1.7.13.2. Had all personnel conducting VIP operations been trained in confined space awareness? (AFI 32-4002, AFOSH STD 48-1 and 91-25, 29 CFR 1910)

A1.7.13.3. Were all personnel trained to at least the awareness level in hazardous material response (level 1) within 180 days of arrival on station? (AFI 32-4002, AFOSH STD 48-1 and 91-25, 29 CFR 1910)

A1.7.13.4. Were all personnel trained to HAZMAT Operations Level? (PACAF Sup 1 to AFI 32-3001, 29 CFR 1910)

A1.7.13.5. Were all personnel trained in Emergency Response to Terrorism? (AFI 32-4002, EOD WMD CONOPS and PACAF Sup 1 to AFI 32-3001)

A1.7.13.6. Were all personnel trained in Force Protection Level I training annually and within 6 months of traveling outside the U.S.? (PACAF Sup 1 to AFI 32-3001, DOD 2000.16, DOD 2000.12H)

A1.7.13.7. Were all personnel trained in Force Protection Level II training? (PACAF Sup 1 to AFI 32-3001, DOD 2000.16, DOD 2000.12H)

A1.8. READINESS FLIGHT

A1.8.1. Disaster Preparedness Planning and Management

A1.8.1.1. (#) Were Home Station and Deployed Location Readiness program requirements based on current threat documents (i.e., Peninsula Intelligence Estimate (PIE), Combined Intelligence Estimate for Airbase Operability Planning (CIEAP), Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) threat)? (AFI 10-212; AFI 32-4001, PACAF Sup 1, para 1.13)

A1.8.1.2. Did planning documents address the NBCC threat in detail to include specific agents, means of delivery, expected concentrations, etc.? (AFI 10-212; AFI 32-4001, PACAF Sup 1, para 1.13)

A1.8.1.3. Were all installation activities provided adequate guidance to accomplish applicable passive defense measures (hardening, dispersal, contamination control, and NBC defense IAW the threat)? (AFI 10-212, para 2.2)

A1.8.1.4. Were installation activities provided adequate guidance to accomplish applicable recovery actions? (AFI 10-212, para 2.3)

A1.8.1.5. (#) Did the Civil Engineer Readiness Flight (CEX) implement a Readiness Council (or equivalent) to brief the installation commander on the status of the readiness program and advise the installation commander on required measures to ensure Readiness program

elements met the validated threat? (AFI 32-4001, para 1.12; AFI 32-4001, Sup 1, para 1.11.13)

A1.8.1.6. (#) Did the CEX assist the Survival Recovery Center (SRC) or Commander's/Contingency Support Staff (CSS) commander in implementing Readiness measures according to the appropriate threat scenario? (AFI 10-212, para 1.11)

A1.8.1.7. Had mutual support agreements been coordinated with civil authorities (U.S. areas only)? (AFI 32-4001, para 1.11)

A1.8.1.8. Were Contamination Control Area operations included in planning and training requirements (to include the use of Contaminant Air Processing Systems)? (AFI 32-4001, Chap 5; AFI 10-212, para 1.11)

A1.8.1.9. Had mutual disaster support plans been coordinated with nearby US/DoD organizations, and did these plans comply with host nation agreements (overseas areas)? (AFI 32-4001, para 1.11)

A1.8.1.10. Did the CEX ensure the installation commander and senior staff were briefed on the status of (as a minimum) the installation DP plans, training, equipment and individual/collective protection programs? (AFI 32-4001, 1.12 & Atch 2, PACAF Sup 1)

A1.8.1.11. Did the CEX brief new commanders on specific Readiness and NBC defense policies, organization and status of program initiatives? (AFI 32-4001, A2.2.1 as supplemented)

A1.8.1.12. If required, had the CEX organized, trained and equipped a Disaster Preparedness Support Team (DPST) to support emergency operations? (AFI 32-4001, A2.2.7)

A1.8.1.13. Was there at least one International Air Transport Association trained/certified individual on the installation? (International Commercial Air Transportation Directive)

A1.8.1.14. (#) Had the CEX developed a base Oplan 32-1 IAW AFI 10-212, Chap 2, AFI 32-4001, Chap 2 & A2.2.9, AFI 32-4002, AFPAM 10-219 and AFMAN 32-4004?

A1.8.1.15. (#) Had the CEX ensured other installation planning documents (i.e., Base Support Plan (BSP), Installation Security Plan (ISP), etc.) include applicable Readiness and NBCC requirements? (AFI 32-4001, A2.2.10)

A1.8.1.16. Had the CEX developed an installation directive or supplement to AFI 32-4001 covering program management and administration, if necessary? (AFI 32-4001, para 2.2.1)

A1.8.1.17. Had the CEX reviewed unit checklists and mutual aid agreements that support DP guidance? (AFI 32-4001, A2.2.9)

A1.8.1.18. (#) Did assigned and attached units support the installation DP program with planning, training and operational activities, and had they coordinated their procedures and checklists with CEX? (AFI 32-4001, para 1.13)

A1.8.1.19. Had units appointed a DP representative to manage and coordinate unit aspects of the DP program? (AFI 32-4001, para 1.13.1)

A1.8.1.20. (#) Had units established a unit control center and identified specialized teams as required? (AFI 32-4001, para 1.13.8)

A1.8.1.21. (#) Did the installation have a viable plan to support home station emergency response and wartime requirements with residual forces once mobility teams were deployed? (AFI 32-4001, atch 3; AFI 10-211, para 2.1.4)

A1.8.1.22. Were CEX and DPST personnel free of additional duties, which could interfere with their emergency response requirements? (AFI 32-4001, Sup 1, para A2.2.7)

A1.8.2. Installation Disaster Preparedness Training Program

A1.8.2.1. (#) Were installation personnel trained by CEX as required to meet mission requirements and was that training effectively managed? (AFI 32-4001, paras 6.1 & 6.4)

A1.8.2.2. (#) Were CEX classroom and training resources sufficient to support student load and course objectives? (AFH 32-1084, Sec N)

A1.8.2.3. Did CEX use Readiness Training Packages (RTPs) and locally-developed materials to create required courses of instruction? (AFI 32-4001, Chap 6)

A1.8.2.4. Was documentation of training adequate to determine the installation's readiness status and project future training needs? (AFI 32-4001, para 6.4.2)

A1.8.2.5. Were requirements for CEX personnel included in the installation annual formal training submissions? (AFI 32-4001, para 6.2)

A1.8.2.6. (#) Was proficiency training and professional development for CEX personnel adequately managed and documented (i.e., OJT to include in-house training)? (AFI 32-4001, para 6.2.2)

A1.8.2.7. Did the installation DP information program address all applicable ABO and Readiness subjects (i.e., Common Task Soldering Skills, major accidents, natural disasters, installation threat, etc.)? (AFI 10-212, para 3.2.4; AFI 32-4001, para 6.6)

A1.8.3. Installation Disaster Preparedness Logistics Program

A1.8.3.1. Did installation contingency planning documents contain adequate guidance on the type and quantities of DP and NBCC defense equipment required to support home station, deployed and additive forces? (AFI 32-4001, para 3.1)

A1.8.3.2. (#) Had CEX identified and procured equipment, supplies and applicable Technical Orders/Materials to support home station, training and deployed operational requirements? (AFI 32-4001, para 3.1; T.O. 00-5-1)

A1.8.3.3. Did CEX schedule equipment requiring calibration on a staggered basis to ensure adequate amounts on-hand for response operations? (AFI 32-4001, Sup 1, para 4.1.2; applicable T.O.s)

A1.8.3.4. (#) Did the Mobile Command Post have adequate equipment and communications to support on-scene command and control operations? (AFI 32-4001, para 3.4 as supplemented and AFMAN 32-4004)

A1.8.3.5. (#) Did CEX maintain adequate LMR communications to support Unit Control Center as well as responding 3E9/DPST Members? (AFMAN 32-4004, para 1.9)

A1.8.3.6. (#) Was CEX equipment properly maintained and stored in areas protected from fire, pilferage, extreme weather, humidity and dust and was it readily accessible? (Applicable T.O.s)

A1.8.4. Installation Disaster Preparedness Operations

A1.8.4.1. Were primary and alternate On-Scene Disaster Control Group (OSDCG) members assigned, trained and equipped to ensure immediate response? (AFI 32-4001, para 1.11.4; AFMAN 32-4004)

A1.8.4.2. If tasked by installation plans, can the CEX and Fire Protection Flight determine hazardous materials impact using available automated programs, i.e., ALOHA, CHARM? (AFI 32-4001, PACAF Sup 1, para 3.5)

A1.8.4.3. Did OSDCG and UCC emergency response checklists cover all applicable accident scenarios based on assigned weapons systems, WMD threats, and priority resources? (AFI 32-4001, para 2.2.4; AFMAN 32-4004)

A1.8.4.4. Were Disaster Response Force (DRF) notification procedures (duty, non-duty and comm out situations) adequate to ensure timely response by all elements? (AFI 32-4001, para 4.2; AFMAN 32-4004)

A1.8.4.5. Were procedures established to ensure operations under the Incident Command System and OSDCG organization properly support hazardous materials response? (AFI 32-4002, Chap 4)

A1.8.4.6. (#) Was the installation warning and notification system capable of providing rapid and effective dissemination of disaster and severe weather information? (AFI 32-4001, para 7.1)

A1.8.5. Readiness Personnel/DPST/Augmentee Task Performance

A1.8.5.1. Were personnel trained and proficient in Global Positioning System plotting and reporting (3E9 & DPST, if so trained)? (3E9XX CFETP)

A1.8.5.2. (#) Were personnel trained and proficient in map plotting using latitude/ longitude and Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) (3E9 & DPST, if so trained)? (3E9XX CFETP)

A1.8.5.3. (#) Were personnel able to operationally check and use assigned detection equipment (3E9 & DPST, if so trained)? (3E9XX CFETP)

A1.8.5.4. Were personnel able to (if tasked by installation plans) operate WeatherPak system (3E9 & DPST, if so trained)? (3E9XX CFETP)

A1.8.5.5. Were personnel able to (if tasked by installation plans) compute downwind HAZMAT endangered areas using automated systems (3E9XX)? (3E9XX CFETP)

A1.8.6. Prime BEEF Program

A1.8.6.1. (#) Had the unit developed a comprehensive Contingency Response Plan to direct unit response to local contingencies? (AFI 10-211, para 1.4)

A1.8.6.2. (#) Did the unit conduct and properly document training for Prime BEEF Category I and II requirements? (AFI 10-210, paras 3.3 & 3.4)

A1.8.6.3. Were appropriate functional area instructors used to the maximum extent possible to provide Prime BEEF Category I and II training requirements? (AFI 10-210, para 3.4)

A1.8.6.4. Were Prime BEEF members qualified on all required/appropriate vehicles and equipment? (AFI 10-210, Table 3)

A1.8.6.5. (#) Were Status of Resources and Training System (SORTS) data properly calculated and reported for personnel, equipment and supplies, and training? (AFI 10-201, Chaps 3, 4 & 6)

A1.8.6.5.1. Did SORTS worksheets accurately reflect all data required to be reported? (AFI 10-201, Chaps 3, 4 & 6)

A1.8.6.6. Were all Prime BEEF teams properly postured? (AFI 10-210, para 2.2.7)

A1.8.6.7. (#) Had CEX identified and procured Prime BEEF equipment, supplies and applicable Technical Orders/Materials to support home station, training and deployed operational requirements? (AFI 10-210, Chap 4)

A1.8.6.8. (#) Was Prime BEEF equipment properly maintained and stored in areas protected from fire, pilferage, extreme weather, humidity and dust and was it readily accessible? (AFI 10-210, Chap 4)

A1.8.6.9. Did the appropriate functional area experts and team chiefs support Prime BEEF training? (CONOPS on CE Readiness Flight, Section 6c)

A1.8.6.10. Were individuals designated to perform courier, guard, in-flight security or similar duties trained and qualified with the .38-cal or 9mm pistol? (AFI 10-210, para 3.4.1.2.3)

A1.8.6.11. Did the unit properly forecast Silver Flag Exercise Site training requirements? (PACAFI 10-211, para 4.2, AFI 10-210, Chap 3)

A1.8.6.12. Did the unit properly forecast Mobile Contingency Skills Training requirements? (PACAFI 10-211, para 4.2, AFI 10-210, Chap 3)

A1.9. ENGINEERING FLIGHT

A1.9.1. Flight Management

A1.9.1.1. (#) Did the Engineering Flight Chief ensure programming, design, and construction activities supported the Base General Plan and its Annexes? (PACAF/CC Memo, "Integrated Unfunded Requirements Process", 12 Jan 99; PACAF/CE Memo, "Program Development Using the Base General Plan", 31 Mar 99)

A1.9.1.2. (#) Did the Chief of Contracts (CECC) maximize effectiveness of project design efforts by working from the Base General Plan Annexes and the priority listing approved by the Facilities Board (FB) and avoid designing projects which were unlikely to receive advertising authority (ATA) and construction funding? (PACAF/CE Memo, "Program Development Using the Base General Plan", 31 Mar 99)

A1.9.1.2.1. Did the CECC utilize a design schedule for all projects to be designed in the fiscal year?

A1.9.1.2.2. Did Chief of Engineering share the design schedule with LGC?

A1.9.1.3. Did project managers/inspectors rigorously monitor/update the computerized project information in the Automated Civil Engineer System, Program Management module (ACES-PM),

ensuring their inputs or those of others were accurate, complete, and current? (AFI 32-1023, para 5.7)

A1.9.1.4. (#) For each project, did project managers/inspectors maintain an inspection folder in which all aspects of preparation, daily entries and requirements for maintaining AF Form 1477, Construction Inspection Record, were correctly accomplished? (AFI 32-1023, para 6.8)

A1.9.1.4.1. Were diary entries of sufficient detail and scope to track any deficiencies until the contractor corrected them and ensured all systems met requirements before the BOD? (AFI 32-1023, para 6.8)

A1.9.1.5. Were final plans and specifications reviewed by the appropriate CE personnel who were tasked to maintain the systems and had site visits been accomplished to ensure constructability and maintainability prior to advertising for bids? (AFI 32-1023, para 5.13)

A1.9.1.6. Was an Air Force Engineering Technical Letter (ETL) and Construction Technical Letter (CTL) library current and available to all designers? (AFI 32-1023, chap 2)

A1.9.1.6.1. Were projects designed IAW programming documents (DD Form 1391/1391 c), needs assessment validation study (NAF projects), current CTLs and ETLs, and were design analyses, which documented design considerations and decisions and properly referenced ETL/CTL compliance, accomplished for all projects as required? (AFI 32-1023, para 5.1)

A1.9.1.6.2. Were all force protection requirements coordinated with Security Forces? (USAF Installation Force Protection Guide, Ch 2)

A1.9.1.6.3. Were projects designed IAW with the latest AT/FP guidance? (Interim Department of Defense Antiterrorism/Force Protection Construction Standards, 16 Dec 1999 and Draft USCINCPAC Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection Construction Standards Interim Guidance, Nov 2000)

A1.9.1.7. (#) Was there an exterior paint and finish plan (a component of the Base Architectural Compatibility Standards or the Base Comprehensive Plan) and was it followed for new construction, minor construction and maintenance and repair work? (AFI 32-1023, para 5.1)

A1.9.1.8. Did project managers prepare individual project design schedules accounting for such milestones as ready-to advertise dates imposed by funding constraints, higher headquarters technical review/coordination when applicable, base agency reviews for functional adequacy and responsiveness to AF requirements, or other strategic schedule requirements driven by programs, budgets, or commanders? (PACAF/CC memo, "Execution Guidance for PACAF Engineering Projects," 20 Dec 96)

A1.9.1.9. Was Government Furnished Material (GFM) tracked for timely availability (procurement, shipping, receipt dates) for those contracts requiring a contractor to install or otherwise use GFM? (AFI 32-1023, para 6.8)

A1.9.1.10. Did CECC specify designer preparation of color board and contractor submittal of consolidated color board to fully coordinate interior design considerations between the users, architect, designers, project inspectors, and contract administrators?

A1.9.1.11. (#) Did project managers/inspectors properly document field problems and notify the Contracting Officer of all required changes (regardless of whether or not changes impact contract cost)? (AFI 32-1023, Chap 6)

A1.9.1.12. Did the base utilize published facility design standards (exterior/interior)? (AFI 32-1023, para 5.1)

A1.9.1.13. (#) Were all O&M project designs on track to meet MAJCOM milestone of having 95 percent of projects awarded by 30 June? (HQ PACAF Fiscal Guidance, para 21.d)

A1.9.1.14. (#) Were all environmental O&M (pollution prevention, compliance, restoration and conservation resources) project designs on track to meet Air Staff s goal of having 100 percent of projects awarded by 30 June? (HQ USAF/CEV Memo, *Environmental Leadership*, 27 Nov 96)

A1.9.1.15. Were end-customers (user, CE Facility Maintenance Element and Maintenance Engineering representatives, at a minimum) involved in project design review? (AFI 32-1023, chap 5)

A1.9.1.16. Did end-customers (user, CE Facility Maintenance Element and Maintenance Engineering representatives, at a minimum) participate in periodic and final construction walk-through inspections? (AFI 32-1023, chap 6)

A1.9.1.17. For Small Purchase Orders, were Statements of Work (SOW) comprehensive and clear, did they ensure delivery of quality goods that conform to USAF standards, and were they written in a manner to prevent substandard work?

A1.9.1.17.1. Were contracts being issued for SOW when another purchasing tool would result in substantial cost savings to Air Force, such as blanket purchase agreement?

A1.9.1.17.2. Were alternative methods of purchasing commodities under SOW contracts considered (such as purchasing items under GSA Schedule, as government provided material or writing a memorandum giving the contractor permission to purchase for specific projects under GSA Schedule pricing)?

A1.9.1.17.3. Were GSA sales representatives being encouraged to provide both commodity and service as a bidder on SOWs in order to provide cost savings?

A1.9.2. Simplified Acquisition of Base Engineering Requirements (SABER)

A1.9.2.1. As part of the acquisition planning process, was the requiring activity adequately coordinating with users in the planning process? (FAR 7.101 & 7.102)

A1.9.2.2. Was the responsibility for forecasting needs supported by appropriate level personnel to establish determination of need, and was the bonafide need based on mission support of the requiring activity or program? (FAR 7.101 & 7.102)

A1.9.2.3. After bonafide need was established, was planning with the requiring activity primarily accomplished by senior personnel, such as the program manager or project manager? (FAR 7.101 & 7.102)

A1.9.2.3.1. Was the responsible planner coordinating planning with organizations or persons who played a role in acquisition, including the contracting activity? (FAR 7.101 & 7.102)

A1.9.2.3.2. Were blanket purchase agreements (BPAs) being used appropriately (did they consider suppliers whose past performance had shown to be dependable and who offered quality supply services at consistently lower prices than others that were available)? (FAR 13.202)

A1.9.2.3.3. Were micro-purchases awarded without soliciting competitive quotations if the contracting officer or individual appointed in accordance with FAR 1.603(b) considered the price reasonable? (FAR 13.106-1)

A1.9.3. Base Development Element

A1.9.3.1. (#) Had the base instituted a process to ensure the contract planning system was effectively managed in accordance with the current Base General Plan? (DoDD 4001.1, DoDD 4165.6, AFI 32-1032, paras 1.2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 3.2)

A1.9.3.1.1. Did the base have a current 5-year O&M program validated by the Facilities Board? (AFI 32-7062, chap 2)

A1.9.3.1.2. Did all projects that received a FIM Critical or Degraded rating have proper documentation that supported the rating? (AF AFIM I&O Guide, Annex G)

A1.9.3.1.3. Were all FIM Critical projects programmed for accomplishment within the current or next fiscal year? (AF FIM I&O Guide Annex G)

A1.9.3.1.4. Did the base have a current 5-year MFH program?

A1.9.3.1.5. Was there a 5-year plan for the Non-appropriated Fund (NAF) activity? (DoDI 7700.18, AFI 32-7062, chap 2 and AFI 34-105, para 2)

A1.9.3.1.6. Did the base have a current MILCON priority list developed according to AF MILCON Investment priorities and PACAF MILCON guidance?

A1.9.3.2. Were programming documents for the various programs (i.e., MILCON, Host Nation, NAF, P-341, O&M, tenant) properly accomplished, completed, and submitted/approved in a timely manner prior to start of project design? (DoDD 4001.1, DoDD 4165.6, DoDI 7700.18, AFI 32-1021, AFI 32-1022 and AFI 32-1032)

A1.9.3.2.1. (For Japan Bases) Did the Japan host nation construction (JFIP) chief have a milestone schedule for JFIP Form 22 and 5-year plan submittals to 5 AF/CE? (USFJ JFYXX Facilities Improvement Program Booklet)

A1.9.3.2.2. (For Japan Bases) Did the unit maintain a list of host nation funded projects identified as requiring US-funded elements (conjunctive funding) and their associated costs? (JFY03 Facilities Improvement Program Instructions, V2, Nov 00)

A1.9.3.3. (#) Was construction work properly classified IAW AFI 32-1032, para 4.1?

A1.9.3.3.1. Were Minor Construction (MC) projects documented and approved separately from companion maintenance and repair (M/R) projects? (AFI 32-1032, para 4.1.2.2.5)

A1.9.3.4. (#) Was there a positive tracking and control system in place to monitor all MC work on a facility to ensure the $500,000 MC statutory limitation was not exceeded within a 12 month period? (AFI 32-1032, para 5.1.2, 5.3.3)

A1.9.3.5. (#) **Were all known work requirements on a single facility consolidated, programmed, and approved under one project? (AFI 32-1022, para 5.1.2 and AFI 32-1032, paras 4.1.2.2.5 and 5.3)**

A1.9.3.6. Were O&M funds ever used to correct deficiencies for MILCON funded projects? (AFI 32-1032, para 3.4.2)

A1.9.3.7. Did the unit ensure appropriate coordination was secured on project documents prior to obtaining project approval (user, siting, environmental, fire protection, safety, communications, etc.)? (DoDI 7700.18, para 3.6, AFI 32-1001, para 6, AFI 32-7061, para 1.3.4 and 3.1, and AFI 32-7066, para 2.1.1)

A1.9.3.8. Did personnel utilize proper instructions/guidance to verify space allowances/requirements? (AFI 32-1024 and AFH 32-1084)

A1.9.3.9. Were appropriate waivers or exception to space criteria approval documents available for those functions that exceeded the authorized space or for facilities that did not have established criteria? (AFI 32-1022, Atch 3, AFI 32-1024)

A1.9.3.10. (#) For projects approved below the installation commander project approval authority, were letters of delegation available? (AFI 32-1032, para 1.4)

A1.9.3.10.1. Did project approval delegates know the limit of their approval authority?

A1.9.3.11. (#) Wss the fund source specified in AFI 65-106, Attachment 1, for NAF facilities followed?

A1.9.3.11.1. If the fund source was not IAW AFI 65-106, was a waiver to fund source document available?

A1.9.3.12. (#) Were new NAF facilities sited in accordance with the Base General Plan? (COMPACAF Memo - Jun 99)

A1.9.3.12.1. For NAF facilities, was APF used to correct life safety code compliance deficiencies? (DoDD 1015.6, DoDI 7700.18, AFI 32-1022, para 3.6.1)

A1.9.3.13. Did ACES-PM reflect the priority of all the projects approved by the FB, including current project information?

A1.9.3.13.1. Were O&M facility projects over $500,000 provided with narrative input on the ACES-PM justification screen? (Required for Budget Estimate Submission (BES))

A1.9.3.14. Was an economic analysis for O&M projects over $2 million accomplished and submitted to MAJCOM together with the programming document? (DoDI 7041.30, AFI 65-501, Chaps 1 and 2)

A1.9.3.15. (#) Did the unit ensure project approval authority was not exceeded (cost and scope)? (AFI 32-1032, para 4.4)

A1.9.3.16. Did the base maintain a current tenant facility program? (AFI 32-1032, para 6.2)

A1.9.3.17. Were programming documents of projects validated by the Facilities Board for FY+1 approved, with designs in progress?

A1.9.3.17.1. Were projects planned for FY+2 in the programming process of validation and document preparation?

A1.9.3.18. Did the base have approval documents for all relocatable facilities? (DoDI 4165.56, AFI 32-1021, para 6.2)

A1.9.3.19. (#) Did the base have an approved airfield waiver program and were they taking actions to reduce obstructions where possible? (AFMAN 32-1123, PACAF Sup 1 - Airfield Waivers)

A1.9.3.20. Was the base complying with frangibility requirements for approved airfield obstructions, whenever possible? (AFMAN 32-1123, para A14.2.3.)

A1.9.3.21. Did the project manager/programmer assemble a planning team (consisting of intelligence, operations, security, logistics, engineering, and functional users, at a minimum) to identify security requirements for programmed/planned facilities and had the team identified applicable design constraints for projects? (AFMAN 32-1071V1, para 1-6).

A1.9.3.21.1. Had the planning team identified the assets to be housed in the facility or which were part of the project, had they identified the threats to each identified asset, and had they determined the appropriate level of protection for the assets against identified threats? (AFMAN 32-1071V1, para 1-6 and 3-4 through 3-11).

A1.9.3.21.2. Had DD Forms 2683, 2684, and 2685 been completed for assets? (AFMAN 32-1071V1, para 3-4 through 3-11)

A1.9.3.21.3. Were security design criteria recommended for approval to the Wing/installation commander and incorporated into the project's programming documents or requirements documents? (USAF Installation Force Protection Guide, Ch 2)

A1.10. WAR RESERVE MATERIAL MANAGEMENT (Deconflict duplication with IGLS inspector)

A1.10.1. WRM Program Management

A1.10.1.1. (#) Were monitors and alternates appointed in writing to the War Reserve Material Officer (WRMO) and did they meet appointment and retainability requirements? (PACAFI 25-101, para 1.53, 2.24.2.2)

A1.10.1.2. (#) Did the WRM monitor maintain a continuity book? (PACAFI 25-101, para 1.53)

A1.10.1.2.1. At a minimum, did it contain the following: a current appointment letter; AFI 25-101 and PACAFI 25-101; current signed copy of the Custodial Receipt Listing (CA/CRL) and applicable R-34 and (DID-40); WRM budget submissions for current and previous FY; budget requirements submittal for "Fee for Use Requirements" of WRM during local Exercises; last SAV report and unit replies; maintenance inspection schedule; copies of WRM working group meeting for the last 12 months; and WRM Training Handouts? (PACAFI 25-101, para 1.53.7)

A1.10.1.3. (#) Did the unit abide by the peacetime use policy for WRM assets? (PACAFI 25-101, para 2.26)

A1.10.1.4. Was that portion of WRM assets authorized for PACAF in-place forces used during local Initial Response Readiness Exercises (IRRE)/Combat Employment Response Exercises (CERE)? (AFI 25-101, para 2.26.4.5, 2.26.4.8-10)

A1.10.2. WRM Inspection and Maintenance

A1.10.2.1. (#) Had the unit established a corrosion control program for their WRM? (PACAFI 25-101, para 3.2 & 3.7)

A1.10.2.2. (#) Did the unit include WRM in-maintenance planning and scheduling documentation? (PACAFI 25-101, para 3.2)

A1.10.2.3. (#) Did the WRM monitor ensure required inspections were performed? (PACAFI 25-101, para 3.2)

A1.10.2.4. Was the initial acceptance inspection(s) conducted within 60 calendar days of asset receipt and documented on appropriate forms? (PACAFI 25-101, para 3.3.1)

A1.10.2.5. (#) Did the WRM monitor ensure all assets that require tagging were tagged with proper AF Forms and condition properly annotated? (PACAFI 25-101, para 3.8)

A1.10.2.6. (#) Did the WRM monitor ensure an adequate number of current T.O.'s, TM's, TCTO's were on-hand for peacetime maintenance and inspections? (PACAFI 25-101, para 3.9)

A1.10.2.7. (#) Did the WRM monitor ensure operation and maintenance records were maintained according to applicable T.O.s, TM's, and other prescribing directives? (PACAFI 25-101, para 3.10)

A1.11. INSTALLATION EXERCISE PROGRAM (To be administered to CVI/EET and CEX, as appropriate)

A1.11.1. Administration/Planning

A1.11.1.1. Were evaluators assigned and trained to assess all areas to include UCC's, Shelter, Contamination Control, PITCPS, CAPS, DIDD Kits, etc.?

A1.11.1.2. Had the Exercise Evaluation Team (EET) Chief published a local directive delineating program requirements? (AFI 32-4001, Sup 1, para 5.4.1.1)

A1.11.1.3. (#) Did the EET composition include all participating agencies, including associate/tenant units? (AFI 32-4001, Sup 1, para 5.4.1.1)

A1.11.1.4. (#) Did the EET Chief ensure EET members received all training applicable to areas they evaluate? (AFI 32-4001, para 5.4.1)

A1.11.1.5. Did the EET Chief develop checklists to guide exercise evaluation? (AFI 32-4001, para 5.4.2)

A1.11.1.6. Did the EET Chief establish exercise objectives for exercise scenarios? (AFI 32-4001, para 5.4.3)

A1.11.1.7. Did the EET Chief consult CEX and other functional area experts, to ensure exercises included applicable and appropriate scenarios? (AFI 32-4001, para 5.4.3 as supplemented & A2.2.19)

A1.11.2. Execution

A1.11.2.1. (#) Did the EET conduct all required exercises? (AFI 32-4001, para 5.3)

A1.11.2.1.1. Did the installation exercise program test all probable response scenarios? (AFI 32-4001, para 5.3)

A1.11.2.2. (#) Did the EET evaluate the minimum required areas during each exercise? (AFI 32-4001, Sup 1, para 5.2.2)

A1.11.2.3. Were props, simulated casualties, and other scenario development inputs realistic and appropriate to the situation? (AFI 32-4001, para 5.1.2)

A1.11.2.4. Were EET Members in appropriate places to evaluate actions of key functional areas (in response/ reaction to the Notification, Response, Withdrawal and Recovery phases) for major accident exercises? (AFMAN 32-4004; appropriate RTP)

A1.11.2.5. Were all exercise objectives met before ENDEX was announced? (AFMAN 32-4004; appropriate RTP)

A1.11.3. Reports and Analysis

A1.11.3.1. (#) Did the EET Chief provide a debriefing, critique and report for each exercise? (AFI 32-4001, para 5.4.8)

A1.11.3.2. Did the EET assign grades to each exercise using the PACAF/IG rating criteria? (AFI 32-4001, Sup 1, para 5.2.4)

A1.11.3.3. (#) Did exercise reports identify deficiencies and require corrective action replies to the EET Chief, and copy/coordination with CEX? (AFI 32-4001, para 5.4.9)

A1.11.3.4. (#) Did the EET Chief perform trend analysis of the exercise program, and were these trends provided to the CEX for proper evaluation of the adequacy/applicability of training, planning and checklists? (AFI 32-4001, paras 5.4.9-5.4.10)

Attachment 2

CIVIL ENGINEER IRRI OBJECTIVES

Objective	Unit OPR	Method	Evaluated By	Assessment	Input Method	Reference
1. Unit Deployment Processing	CE, with LG	Installation/ Unit Deploy-ment Plan and Procedures	Review of Installation Deployment Plan, observe unit prep and execution procedures	Adequacy of preparation, unit briefs, capability to meet assembly and chalk times, discrepancies for personnel and cargo	Execution Message, installation deploymen t plan execution	PAFI 90-201, A3.2.3
2. Unit Reception Plan/Brief	CE	Home Station BSP Review	Base Support Plan and unit reception and beddown plan review	Knowledge of and completeness of brief, integration plan for cargo and personnel	Card	PAFI 90-201, A3.2.3
3. OPLAN tasked BSP brief	CE	Deployed Location BSP Review	Base Support Plan review	Knowledge of and completeness of brief for OPLAN tasked deployed location, major objectives, primary tasks, weapon systems supported, infrastructure, LIMFACs, etc.	Card	PAFI 90-201, A3.2.3
4. WRM Employment/ Deployment	CE, with LG	Home Station and/or Deployed Location BSP Review	Home Station and Deployed Location BSP review	Knowledge of requirements, response time, completeness and quality of employment/ deployment	Execution Message, Card	PAFI 90-201, A3.2.3

Objective	Unit OPR	Method	Evaluated By	Assessment	Input Method	Reference
5. Incident Response	CE, with SF, SG, Base Populace	Threat-based Task eval and observe response actions	Evaluation of threat, situational assessment, response time and actions; OPLAN 32-1 and CRP review	Unit response to IED/ WMD/threat-based situation, assessment, response and recovery	Card, training device, phone call, etc.	PAFI 90-201, A3.2.4
6. Command and Control	CE	OPLAN 32-1, CRP and unit C2 CONOPs review	Review of UCC/DCC practices, procedures and CONOPs	Capability of unit to effectively control resources, identify, report and properly mitigate threats to C2	Card, simulated event, e-mail, disruption of service	PAFI 90-201, A3.2.1
7. Contract or Service Default and Procedures	CE, with CONS, JA, FM	Home Station BSP and CRP Review	Deployment of procedures outlined in Home Station BSP/CRP or innovative workarounds	Knowledge of procedures, thoroughness and feasibility of workaround plan, utilization of assets	Card	PAFI 90-201, A3.2.3
8. SABC	CE	Injury/casualty during IRRI activities	Compliance with medical procedures and practices	Knowledge of and execution of proper initial and follow-on procedures	Card	PAFI 90-201, A3.2.4
9. FPCON Implementa-tion	CE, with SF, Threat WG	Installation Security Plan, FPCON measures, unit-specific implementatio n measures/ plan	Installation Security Plan review, FPCON measures review, CRP and BSP review	Correct and timely implementation of measures, completeness of measures tailored to unit, unit response to increased FPCON	Card	PAFI 90-201, A3.2.4

Objective	Unit OPR	Method	Evaluated By	Assessment	Input Method	Reference
10. INFOCON Implementation	CE, with SC, Threat WG	Installation Information Security/ Protection Plan, INFOCON measures, unit-specific implementation measures/ plan	Installation Information Security/ Protection Plan/Program review, INFOCON measures review	Correct and timely implementation of measures, completeness of measures tailored to unit, unit response to increased INFOCON	Card	PAFI 90-201, A3.2.4

Attachment 3

CIVIL ENGINEER CERI OBJECTIVES

Objective	Unit OPR	Method	Evaluated By	Assessment	Input Method	Reference
1. Airbase Expansion Planning	CE	BSP Review. Task Eval	Base Support Plan review & task evaluation	Thoroughness and accuracy of Force Beddown Planning/Brief	Task Eval Card	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.3.4
2. Airbase Expansion Construction	CE	BSP Review. Task Eval	Base Support Plan review & expedient construction	Timeliness and effectiveness of tasked expedient construction.	Task Eval Card	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.3.4
3. Shelter Management (CPS and non-CPS shelters)	CE, Base Populace	Observe unit actions	Review Base Support Plan & shelter operations	Evaluate shelter set-up, operation, and utilization, to include adequacy of CPS mechanical system, as applicable.	None	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.4
4. Expedient Hardening	CE, Base Populace	BSP Review. Observe unit actions	Base Support Plan review & expedient hardening of facilities	Execution of Hardening Plan. Assess unit's hardening efforts.	None	*CCC A5.5*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.3.4.
5. Emergency Power Generation Systems Reliability	CE, Base Populace	Task Eval. Ability to Survive and Operate (ATSO) scenarios	Automatic start-up and transfer after electrical outage. Task eval of manual start systems.	Isolation of electrical systems to force units to operate back-up electrical generators. Selective task eval of manual start systems to ensure building occupants can perform assigned duties.	GBSs and scenario; In-put card for task eval.	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.3.4
6. Aircraft Barrier (fixed) Operations	CE	ATSO scenario	Barrier re-wind after cable engaged by an aircraft	Firefighter response to barrier engagement / rewind/re-set Barrier Maint actions to re-service barrier and certify as serviceable.	Input card	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.3.4

Objective	Unit OPR	Method	Evaluated By	Assessment	Input Method	Reference
7. Crash, Fire, Rescue Aircrew Extraction	CE	ATSO scenario	Aircrew ground mishap response	Command and control from unit control centers and Survival Recovery Center (SRC) communication. Incident Command System established during responses. Timely and effective extraction of aircrew member(s) from unit aircraft. Multiple extraction if unit operates different type airframes. Can be scheduled with barrier engagement.	Input card	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.3.4
8. Structural Firefighting/ Rescue	CE	ATSO scenario / Task Eval	Observe Post-attack response actions	Command and control from UCCs, FCC and and SRC. Incident Command System established during responses. Timely and effective response to aircraft, munitions, and structural fire situations. If unit operates large-frame aircraft, can set-up multiple interior rescue operations. Structural fires can be set-up as a task eval to assess interior firefighting operations.	In-put card Can be integrated with hung ordnance operations for fighter aircraft.	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.3.4
9. Battle Damage Assessment (Airfield)	CE	ATSO scenario	Airfield Damage Assessment Team (ADAT) evaluation after SCUD and/or Aircraft Attack	Accuracy of ADAT evaluation of airfield damage. ADAT status reporting to SRC.	GBS and props to simulate cratered runway/ taxiway	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.3.4

Objective	Unit OPR	Method	Evaluated By	Assessment	Input Method	Reference
10. Battle Damage Assessment (Facilities & Utilities)	CE	ATSO scenario	Damage Assessment Reconnais-sance Team (DART) evaluation after repeated attacks.	Accuracy of DART response to multiple facility/utility damage. Accuracy of assessments. Prioritization of multiple facility and utility repair efforts.	GBSs, enhanced photos, and facility damage cards.	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.3.4
11. Minimum Operating Strip (MOS) Selection	CE	ATSO scenario / Task Eval	DAT input and/or MOS selection team task evaluation	Accuracy and timeliness of MOS recommendation and MAOS selection. Selection Team's analysis of airfield damage and recommendations to CC	Task Eval card with airfield damage	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.3.4
12. Rapid Runway Repair (RRR)	CE	ATSO scenario	Repair after SCUD and/ or Aircraft attack on airfield	Determine site access and haul routes. Timely/ accuracy of crater repair operations. RQC measurements accuracy. Timely/ accuracy of mat installation. Integrated multiple crater repairs. Timely and accuracy of centerline marking/ striping.	GBS and cones to simulate runway/ taxiway damage.	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.3.4
13. Mobile Aircraft Arresting System (MAAS)	CE	ATSO scenario	Repair after SCUD and/ or Aircraft attack on airfield	Timely / accuracy and safe installation of the MAAS. Anchoring pattern correct. Integrated operations.	GBS and facility damage input card. May be integrated with RRR.	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.3.4
14. Emergency Airfield Lighting System (EALS)	CE	ATSO scenario	Repair after SCUD/ Aircraft/ Mortar attack on airfield	Timely / accuracy and safe installation of the EALS. Distance-to-go marker set. Integrated with Barrier/ MAAS	GBS and facility damage input card. May be integrated with RRR.	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.3.4.

Objective	Unit OPR	Method	Evaluated By	Assessment	Input Method	Reference
15. Rapid Utilities Repair Kit (RURK)	CE	ATSO scenario	Repair after SCUD/ Aircraft/ Mortar attack on airbase	Timely/accuracy and safe installation of the RURK system.	GBS and facility damage in-put cards on 6" to 12" POL line.	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.3.4
16. Reverse Osmosis Water Purification Unit (ROWPU)	CE	ATSO scenario	Repair after SCUD/ Aircraft/ Mortar attack on airbase	Timely/accuracy and safe operation of the ROWPU system. Sustained operations and schedules. Planned Storage capacity. Chlorination of storage/ distribution system.	GBS and facility damage in-put cards. May be integrated as base expansion plans.	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.3.4
17. Battle Damage Repair of Facilities	CE	ATSO scenario	Repair after SCUD/ Aircraft/ Mortar attack on airbase	Timely and accuracy of planned repair efforts. Selected construction of expedient repairs. Integration and prioritization of multiple repair efforts.	GBS and facility damage in-put cards.	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.3.4
18. Personnel Response and Protection	CE, Base Populace	ATSO scenario	Observe Post-attack response actions	Appropriate wear of CWDE, use of individually issued items. Sufficient Attack/Warning Alarm systems. Urgency and appropriateness of response to attacks.	Repeated conventional and chemical Attacks using GBS and smoke grenades; TBMCS or C2 system alert.	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.4

Objective	Unit OPR	Method	Evaluated By	Assessment	Input Method	Reference
19. Chemical Contamination Avoidance (CCA)	CE, Base Populace	ATSO scenario	Review Base Support Plan, observe pre and post-attack activities to include CCA operations	Timely/accuracy of CCA set-up and operations to include suit aeration and mask refurbishment techniques. Analysis of contaminated area(s) and establishment of CCA, to effectively control contamination. Effective use of resources to include use of individual measures and resource protection techniques.	Persistent area chemical or biological contamination. Usually assessed during 2 separate persistent chemical attacks or during biological attack.	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.4
20. Nuclear, Biological, and Chemical Reconnaissance	CE, Base Populace	ATSO scenario	Observe Post-attack response actions	Timely/accurate reconnaissance and reporting of chemical and biological status after attacks. Implementation of proper detection network, team set-up and route selection.	Installation a, coupled with enemy intel. Possible simulated detector activation, network activation, detection paper change, etc.	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.4

Objective	Unit OPR	Method	Evaluated By	Assessment	Input Method	Reference
21. Explosive Ordnance Reconnaissance	CE, Base Populace	ATSO scenario	Observe Post-attack response actions	Assess timely and accuracy of identification, marking, warning, and reporting of UXOs by unit personnel.	GBSs and UXO training aids during attacks. Also can include Impro-vised Explosive Device (IED) during terrorist attack.	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.3.4
22. Expedient Decontamina-tion	CE, Base Populace	ATSO scenario Task Eval	Observe Post-attack response actions	Evaluate effectiveness of personal and spot vehicle, aircraft, facility, and limited area decontamination operations.	Simulated contamin-ated indi-vidual, vehicle, equipment, aircraft, or facility after attack.	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.4.
23. Nuclear, Biological, and Chemical (NBC) Plotting	CE	ATSO scenario	Observe Post-attack response actions	Accuracy of automated and manual NBC plotting, agent plume delineation/ areal contamination. Timely and accurate submittal of appropriate NBC reports. Effectiveness of analysis and recommendations to the CC.	Simulated chemical and biological contamina-tion after SCUD or appropriate delivery attacks.	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.4
24. Explosive Ordnance Disposal	CE	ATSO scenario / Task Eval	Observe Post-attack response actions	Assess accuracy of EOD operations to render safe UXOs and IEDs. Assess Bomb removal operations after safing operations completed.	GBSs and UXO/IED training aids after attacks.	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.3.4

Objective	Unit OPR	Method	Evaluated By	Assessment	Input Method	Reference
25. Self-Aid/ Buddy Care	CE, Base Populace	ATSO scenario	Observe Post-attack response actions	Assess post attack response to injured members. Assess urgency of and accuracy of medical care provided to injured members. Assess unit's ability to administer nerve-agent antidote, ability to transport injured personnel to CCP.	Injured cards during attacks.	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.4
26. Engineer Resource Protection and Work Party Security	CE	ATSO scenario	Observe active security measures	Assess effectiveness of work site security awareness. Assess ability to detect OPFOR penetration during RRR or expedient construction and repair operations.	OPFOR support and GBSs and UXO training aids.	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.4
27. Base Denial	Wing/ CC, with CE, Base Populace	BSP Review Task Eval	Review BSP, Base Denial Plan, limited base denial actions	Thoroughness and detail of base denial plan briefing. Selected implementation of base denial actions.	In-put card.	*AFI 90-201, Atch 5, CCC, A5.3.3.4.

Attachment 4

FIRE PROTECTION SELF-INSPECTION, IRRI AND CERI CRITERIA

A4.1. FIRE PROTECTION

A4.1.1. General. The fire protection flight must be able to combat fires and rescue personnel with limited resources in a simulated wartime environment. Fire protection will transition from a peacetime to a wartime mode of operation, commence pre-attack actions to conceal and protect resources during airfield attacks, and provide post-attack suppression and rescue response to fire incidents that most seriously jeopardize the combat generation capability of the wing.

A4.1.2. Ratings: The revised version of PACAFI 90-201, *Inspector General Inspection Activities,* does not have Firefighting Operations as a separate graded area. As such, fire fighting operations, management, communications, and fire prevention were included in the appropriate graded area of the report (such as ATSO, Mission Support, or Recovery Operations).

A4.1.3. Management. Fire Protection management will be evaluated by rating the effectiveness of managing personnel, resources, and the ability to survive and operate in a wartime environment.

A4.1.3.1. (#) Did the Fire Protection Flight have a plan to transition from peacetime to wartime and did the plan address all pertinent requirements?

A4.1.3.1.1. (#) Did the transition plan address Pre-attack actions, phases to implement during increased Threat Conditions?

A4.1.3.1.2. (#) Did the transition plan address breakdown of personnel assignments and taskings during wartime?

A4.1.3.1.3. (#) Did the transition plan address personnel responsibilities for each level of assignment?

A4.1.3.1.4. (#) Did the transition plan address measures to take to protect assets to include vehicles, equipment, personnel, agents, spare parts, and physical protection of facilities?

A4.1.3.1.5. (#) Did the transition plan address establishment of procedures to check on the status of agents, equipment, and spares during operations?

A4.1.4. Operations. Fire ground operations will be evaluated to include water supply, initial fire attack operations, Incident Command (IC), completion of tactical objectives, accountability of personnel, proper wear of IPE, and timeliness of coordinated efforts.

A4.1.4.1. (#) Did the responding fire fighting crews report conditions upon arrival at the scene?

A4.1.4.2. (#) Did the responding fire fighting crews' position vehicles according to the scenario?

A4.1.4.3. (#) Did crewmembers perform accepted fire ground practices once on scene?

A4.1.4.3.1. (#) Did crewmembers properly utilize reference materials (Prefire plans, checklists, etc.)?

A4.1.4.3.2. (#) Did crewmembers size-up the situation?

A4.1.4.3.3. (#) Did the on-scene Senior Fire Officer (SFO) assume command and direct actions?

A4.1.4.3.4. (#) Did crewmembers properly report actions, progress from the inside, and status on the fire ground?

A4.1.4.3.5. (#) Did crewmembers effectively utilize assigned equipment?

A4.1.4.3.6. (#) Did crewmembers demonstrate appropriate fire fighting agent application?

A4.1.4.3.7. (#) Did crewmembers demonstrate systematic rescue search patterns, patient handling and care, and report status to SFO?

A4.1.4.3.8. (#) Did crewmembers demonstrate proper ventilation?

A4.1.4.3.9. (#) Did crewmembers demonstrate proper hose operations?

A4.1.4.3.10. (#) Did crewmembers demonstrate proper rope operations?

A4.1.4.3.11. (#) Did crewmembers demonstrate proper ladder operations?

A4.1.4.4. (#) Did fire fighting crews conduct a sweep of vehicle dispersal locations when returning?

A4.1.4.5. (#) Did the SFO ensure personnel were fed, received necessary clean water, restroom breaks, etc.?

A4.1.4.6. (#) Were dispersed assets checked at least once during a 24-hour period?

A4.1.4.7. (#) Did fire fighters conduct appropriate vehicle and equipment inspections utilizing proper documentation, to include Vehicle form (AF Form 1800, 1812, 1819, etc.), Vehicle T.O. or established checklist, vehicle template lubrication charts and plates, established department operating instructions, equipment 1071 form or computer equivalent for assigned equipment, and equipment T.O./manufacturer's instructions and/or established checklist?

A4.1.4.7.1. (#) Was a thorough operational check of the drive train, safety systems and fire fighting equipment conducted?

A4.1.4.8. (#) Was dispersed equipment being checked in a sufficient and timely manner and were checks documented?

A4.1.5. Communications. Communications will be evaluated on the timeliness of recording and accurately dispatching scenario information. In addition, communications methods and procedures on the fire ground will be evaluated for effectiveness and information flow.

A4.1.5.1. (#) Was the Fire Alarm Control Center (FCC) operation effective?

A4.1.5.1.1. (#) Were procedures in place for the operation of the FCC?

A4.1.5.1.2. (#) Did the primary and alternate FCC have redundant equipment and operations?

A4.1.5.1.3. (#) Were the primary and alternate FCC staffed by a Senior Fire Officer?

A4.1.5.1.4. (#) Were direct communications with the SRC available for coordination of priority responses?

A4.1.5.1.5. (#) Were radio communications available with all personnel manning deployed fire apparatus?

A4.1.5.1.6. (#) Did the unit have an established means of communicating during communication outages?

A4.1.5.1.7. (#) Were installation maps or automated equivalent available, and was pertinent information such as facilities, response routes, grid coordinates, and key safety/security concerns, (i.e. munitions storage), ECP locations, and location of fire apparatus dispersal locations, included?

A4.1.5.1.8. (#) Were multiple responses categorized/prioritized and the appropriate crew dispatched in a timely manner?

A4.1.5.1.9. (#) Was the SRC director advised/consulted regarding priority responses and fire protection requirements?

A4.1.5.1.10. (#) Were fire protection assets dispatched according to their vicinity of the response location and capabilities?

A4.1.5.1.11. (#) Once crews started fire fighting activities, did the FCC start an appropriate fire fighter work-rest cycle?

A4.1.6. Fire Protection. Fire prevention will be evaluated based upon fire information flow from/to the base populace and the C2 networks, as well as the competency of the base populace on fire reporting/evacuation procedures and first aid firefighting.

A4.1.6.1. (#) Did the base populace have knowledge of reporting fires and emergency requests as outlined in organizational wartime plans?

A4.1.7. Training. Fire protection training will be evaluated on how fire fighters were trained and prepared to perform wartime fire fighting actions.

A4.1.7.1. (#) Were personnel adequately trained to accomplish their assigned wartime tasks in an NBC situation?

A4.1.7.2. (#) Did personnel recognize, perform limited identification, mark (as appropriate) and report NBC contamination, unexploded ordnance, and damage?

A4.1.7.3. (#) Did personnel demonstrate appropriate contamination avoidance and contamination control techniques?

A4.1.7.4. (#) Did the unit demonstrate proficiency with CCA operations, to include mask refurbishment and the capability to aerate/decon the J-FIRE crew ensemble as appropriate?

A4.1.8. Exercises. Exercises include aircrew extraction, aircraft arresting system reset, structural fire exercises, aircraft crash rescue live fire, and hydrazine response exercises, among others. Fire fighters may also be evaluated on response to real-world emergencies, as determined by the fire chief and the inspector.

A4.1.8.1. Aircrew Extraction. Evaluate the fire department on their capability to respond to a ground emergency requiring the extraction of an aircrew member from a unit assigned/deployed/ transient aircraft. **Do not overlook required safety measures – was the ejection seat(s) safed IAW AFR 66-51, Wing Supplement, Aircraft T.O. and T.O. 00-105E-9.**

A4.1.8.1.1. (#) Was proper command and control demonstrated?

A4.1.8.1.1.1. (#) Did the SFO identify himself/herself and report an incident situation/command statement?

A4.1.8.1.1.2. (#) Did the SFO maintain control of scene and assets on scene?

A4.1.8.1.1.3. (#) Did the SFO direct actions appropriate to scenario?

A4.1.8.1.1.4. (#) Did the SFO report actions being taken/accomplished/situation status?

A4.1.8.1.1.5. (#) Did the SFO track fire fighter work/rest cycle with the FCC, especially when wearing J-FIRE?

A4.1.8.1.2. Rescue crew response and actions.

A4.1.8.1.2.1. Did crews demonstrate proper wear of personal protective equipment (PPE)?

A4.1.8.1.2.2. Did crews demonstrate safe/proper aircraft approach?

A4.1.8.1.2.3. (#) Did crews demonstrate proper entry (normal/manual operation)?

A4.1.8.1.2.4. (#) Did crews demonstrate knowledge of aircraft shutdown and ejection seat safing procedures?

A4.1.8.1.2.5. (#) Did crews demonstrate knowledge of aircraft restraining system release?

A4.1.8.1.2.6. (#) Did crews demonstrate safe aircrew removal?

A4.1.8.1.2.7. Did crews demonstrate teamwork and sense of urgency, and were ARFF crew response and firefighting capabilities properly demonstrated?

A4.1.8.1.2.8. (#) Did crews approach the scene/aircraft IAW established pre-fire plan, OIs and T.O. 00-105E-9?

A4.1.8.1.2.9. (#) Did crews demonstrate appropriate agent application?

A4.1.8.1.2.10. Did crews demonstrate proper hand line deployment and adequate protection of rescue personnel?

A4.1.8.1.2.11. (#) Did crews coordinate re-supply efforts with re-supply team?

A4.1.8.1.2.12. (#) Did crews demonstrate continuous re-supply of at least one ARFF vehicle for sustained operations?

A4.1.8.1.2.13. (#) Did crews demonstrate appropriate interior fire attack (for medium/large frame aircraft)?

A4.1.8.2. Aircraft Arresting System Reset. Evaluate the fire department and power production personnel on their capability to respond to a ground emergency requiring the recovery of a dis-

abled aircraft using an aircraft arresting system and returning the runway to operational condition in a timely manner. **Do not overlook required safety measures – did personnel performing duties follow all safety measures to include proper communications and wear of required PPE?**

A4.1.8.2.1. Initial notification and response.

A4.1.8.2.1.1. Did the arresting gear engagement actions occur IAW the unit plan?

A4.1.8.2.1.2. Did all appropriate agencies receive timely and accurate information?

A4.1.8.2.1.3. (#) Was firefighting equipment properly positioned to provide aircrew/aircraft and rescue personnel safety?

A4.1.8.2.1.4. (#) Were correct safing procedures and hand signals used for disengaging the aircraft from the cable and performing cable rewind?

A4.1.8.2.1.5. Did air traffic control personnel demonstrate proper procedures for runway closure and handling of emergency aircraft?

A4.1.8.2.2. Command and control, crew procedures and rewind actions.

A4.1.8.2.2.1. (#) Was positive command and control maintained throughout the exercise?

A4.1.8.2.2.2. (#) Was the rewind accomplished IAW applicable T.O.'s, OI's and unit directives?

A4.1.8.2.2.3. (#) Were the barrier facilities and equipment properly maintained IAW applicable T.O.'s?

A4.1.8.2.2.4. (#) Was the arresting system expeditiously recycled and readied for the next engagement?

A4.1.8.2.2.5. Did crew demonstrate the proper wear of PPE?

A4.1.8.2.2.6. Did SFO track work/rest cycle with FCC, especially when crew were wearing the J-FIRE?

A4.1.8.2.2.7. Did the certifying official notify the SFO that the barrier was in serviceable condition and certified for another engagement?

A4.1.8.3. Structural Fire Exercise. Evaluate the fire department on no-notice structural fire exercise. This evaluation will be based on the complexity of the scenario and shall determine if firefighting objectives were met. Safety – Ensure personnel performing during this event follow all safety measures to include communications and PPE.

A4.1.8.3.1. FCC.

A4.1.8.3.1.1. Was all pertinent information for the exercise properly recorded and dispatched?

A4.1.8.3.1.2. (#) Were notifications made to all agencies with a need to know/requirement to support?

A4.1.8.3.1.3. Were appropriate log entries made for the event?

A4.1.8.3.1.4. (#) Was appropriate pre-fire plan information relayed to the responding crews as required?

A4.1.8.3.1.5. Were all pertinent radio communications on the fire ground recorded in the log entries?

A4.1.8.3.1.6. (#) Did the FCC start and track fire fighter work/rest cycle with the SFO, when crews were wearing J-FIRE?

A4.1.8.3.2. Fire Protection Response.

A4.1.8.3.2.1. (#) Was the appropriate equipment and were the proper personnel dispatched to handle the response?

A4.1.8.3.2.2. Were all traffic rules/regulations adhered to during the response?

A4.1.8.3.2.3. Were all safety requirements met during the response (lights, sirens, seat belts, stopping at intersections, traffic lights, etc…)?

A4.1.8.3.3. Command and Control.

A4.1.8.3.3.1. Did the SFO arriving on scene report the situation found and a proper command statement?

A4.1.8.3.3.2. (#) Were quick orders and actions directed to establish firefighting efforts/objectives on scene based on the initial size-up?

A4.1.8.3.3.3. (#) Was positive command and control maintained at all times for units on scene?

A4.1.8.3.3.4. (#) Was an accountability system available and used for maintaining status of all personnel on scene?

A4.1.8.3.3.5. (#) Did the SFO coordinate with other agencies on scene (if applicable) to ensure scene integrity?

A4.1.8.3.3.6. Did the SFO forward pertinent information to the FCC regarding status of the situation/support requirements necessary?

A4.1.8.3.3.7. Did the SFO adjust strategy/tactics (if required) to continue an aggressive attack operation?

A4.1.8.3.4. Size-Up of Scenario.

A4.1.8.3.4.1. Was an appropriate size-up conducted by the first arriving unit/SFO?

A4.1.8.3.4.2. Was critical information relayed to the FCC for log entries/coordination of other agencies?

A4.1.8.3.4.3. Did the SFO/first arriving unit weigh any critical size-up conditions and report them for consideration during response operations (i.e., target hazards, critical exposures, significant hazards)?

A4.1.8.3.5. Quick Attack Procedures (initial attack line will be dry).

A4.1.8.3.5.1. Was vehicle positioning appropriate to the exercise scenario?

A4.1.8.3.5.2. (#) Were the appropriate number of supply lines/attack lines deployed for the situation?

A4.1.8.3.5.3. Were an adequate number of personnel assigned to each task/objective (within the scope of a wartime environment)?

A4.1.8.3.5.4. Was an appropriate agent application technique(s) used?

A4.1.8.3.5.5. Was a methodical and systematic procedure(s) used to enter, locate, and attack the fire?

A4.1.8.3.6. Breathing Apparatus/Personal Protective Clothing (Equipment).

A4.1.8.3.6.1. (#) Did each member where their SCBA correctly?

A4.1.8.3.6.2. (#) Was the SCBA engaged (on air) at an appropriate time to prevent IDLH atmosphere from entering face piece?

A4.1.8.3.6.3. Did the SCBAs function as designed?

A4.1.8.3.6.4. (#) Did all personnel wear PPE as required, and in the manner it was designed to be used?

A4.1.8.4. Aircraft Crash Rescue Live Fire. Evaluate the fire department on their ability to control and extinguish a live fire on a simulated aircraft utilizing the department's live fire training area or Mobile Aircraft Fire Trainer, if available. The Fire Chief will be notified approximately **three (3) hours** prior to the event.

A4.1.8.4.1. Was the Pre-Exercise briefing comprehensive and effective?

A4.1.8.4.1.1. Did the Pre-Exercise briefing include situation, dissemination of alarm, vehicle response, simulated rescue, proper AFFF application techniques from vehicle turrets and hand lines (water only for LPG pit), on-scene resupply of water and AFFF, overhaul, wind direction data, fuel spillage, emergency withdrawal signals, and proper wear of PPE and safety procedures, among others.

A4.1.8.4.2. Safety within the training mock-up.

A4.1.8.4.2.1. Did the vehicles approach the position safely (not speeding or turning sharp)?

A4.1.8.4.2.2. Did the crews use spotters for drivers?

A4.1.8.4.2.3. Did personnel properly back out of the training pit?

A4.1.8.4.2.4. Were charged hand lines available and used while personnel were in the mock-up?

A4.1.8.4.2.5. Did personnel wear all required safety gear while in the pit?

A4.1.8.4.2.6. Where hose/turret streams kept away from personnel working in the mock-up area?

A4.1.8.4.3. Did the SFO demonstrate effective on scene command and control?

A4.1.8.4.3.1. (#) Did the SFO have proper knowledge of vehicle crews in application of AFFF (hydrocarbon fueled pit) or AFFF simulated application using water streams (LPG fueled pit)?

A4.1.8.4.3.2. (#) Did the SFO implement proper vehicle positioning and rescue crew actions?

A4.1.8.4.4. (#) Were proper mission management procedures implemented during the exercise?

A4.1.8.4.4.1. (#) Did the SFO maintain positive control of the scene and personnel?

A4.1.8.4.4.2. Did the SFO direct actions necessary to control/extinguish the fire?

A4.1.8.4.4.3. Did crews follow the orders of the SFO during the response and operation?

A4.1.8.4.4.4. Was information forwarded to the FCC to ensure other agencies were advised of the situation/scenario status?

A4.1.8.4.4.5. Did the SFO ensure the proper accountability of all on scene personnel?

A4.1.8.5. Hydrazine Response (if applicable). Evaluate the fire department on their portion of a hydrazine response to include responding to and set-up for in-flight emergency, ground emergency or maintenance mishap. The evaluation will be only for the emergency portion of the scenario and the support role the fire department had during a Hydrazine response IAW wing Oplans and fire department SOPs. **At no time will an IG scenario continue if an actual emergency occurs.**

A4.1.8.5.1. Initial Response, Set-up and Incident Management.

A4.1.8.5.1.1. Was the alarm/exercise information dispatched according to the exercise input?

A4.1.8.5.1.2. Did fire department vehicles set up according to the scenario input/exercise?

A4.1.8.5.1.3. (#) Did the SFO maintain positive command and control?

A4.1.8.5.1.4. Was the aircraft properly positioned in the hydrazine parking/hold area for safety purposes?

A4.1.8.5.1.5. Did responding vehicles properly position according to the hazard?

A4.1.8.5.1.6. (#) Was appropriate PPE worn throughout the exercise?

A4.1.8.5.1.7. (#) Was the health and safety of the pilot managed appropriately?

A4.1.8.5.1.7.1. Was the cockpit pointing into the wind?

A4.1.8.5.1.7.2. Was the pilot transferred over to an escape bottle?

A4.1.8.5.1.7.3. Was the pilot kept on oxygen until safely out of the area?

A4.1.8.5.1.7.4. Did the rescue crew assist the pilot in evacuating the area?

A4.1.8.5.1.8. Did personnel properly employ a sight glass check or litmus test conducted to confirm a hydrazine spill/leak?

A4.1.8.5.1.9. If required, was the spill contained to the immediate area of the aircraft?

A4.1.8.5.1.10. If required, was equipment and personnel decontaminated once removed from the vicinity of the aircraft?

A4.1.8.5.2. Transfer of Emergency.

A4.1.8.5.2.1. (#) Did the SFO brief the hydrazine spill response team of the existing conditions/situation?

A4.1.8.5.2.2. Did the SFO transfer responsibility of the scene to the hydrazine spill response team once the aircraft and pilot risks were adequately reduced?

A4.1.8.5.2.3. Did the SFO maintain a fire department presence in a support role after transfer of responsibility?

Attachment 5

554 RED HORSE SQUADRON
UNIT COMPLIANCE INSPECTION MISSION PERFORMANCE CHECKLIST

A5.1. COMMANDER

A5.1.1. (#) Did the Commander ensure the unit maintained the capability to rapidly deploy personnel and equipment in response to theater contingency and natural disaster situations? (AFI 10-209, para 1.10.1, 2.7 through 2.10)

A5.1.2. (#) Did the Commander establish a reconstitution program and appoint a single point monitor for all reconstitutions? (AFI 10-209, para 1.10.3)

A5.1.3. Did the Commander provide a governing supplement to AFI 10-209 or a unit Operating Instruction that outlined theater requirements and unit-specific roles, responsibilities, and methods to meet AFI requirements? (AFI 10-209, para 1.10.4)

A5.1.4. (#) Did the Commander establish a unit equipment functional check program? (AFI 10-209, para 1.10.5; AFMAN 23-110V2, Part 2, Ch19; AFMAN 24-307, Ch3)

A5.1.5. Did the Commander establish a mandatory unit physical fitness program? (AFI 10-209, para 1.10.7)

A5.1.6. (#) Did the Commander ensure the development of an Annual Troop Training Project Program for past, current and future years had been developed, and that the past year(s) and current year programs were properly executed? (AFI 10-209, para 3.7)

A5.1.6.1. Did the Commander ensure the development of a PACAF Troop training program for past, current, and future years had been developed, and that the past year(s) and current year programs were properly executed? (AFI 10-209, para 3.8)

A5.1.7. Was there an effective SORTS program within the unit with at least two SORTS monitors appointed (primary and alternate, at a minimum) and trained? (AFI 10-201, para 1.17)

A5.1.8. (#) Did the Commander review, initial, and date the SORTS DOC statement (AF Form 723) directly after assuming command, and annually thereafter? (AFI 10-201, para 1.17)

A5.1.9. Did the commander review SORTS results for measured resource areas, assign overall ratings for UTCs and the unit, and ensure that adequate remarks were included? (AFI 10-201, Ch 1)

A5.1.10. (#) Did the unit manage required on-the-job training and formal training (AETC schools) and education (e.g., AFIT) for its people, including projecting all future requirements? (AFI 36-2201, para 4.9, AFI 32-1001, para 1.2)

A5.1.11. (#) Did the Commander ensure an active safety program was implemented within the unit, and supervisors complied with general safety, fire prevention, and occupational health requirements? (AFOSH Standard 91-10, Chap 2)

A5.1.12. (#) Did the Commander ensure Air Force Occupational and Environmental Safety, Fire Protection and Health (AFOSH) requirements were met? (AFI 91-301, para 2.14)

A5.2. OPERATIONS

A5.2.1. (#) Did an effective training program exist for assigned personnel in the various shops/ workcenters? (AFI 26-2201, para 4.10-4.15; AFI 32-1001 para 1.2)

A5.2.2. (#) Was a locally developed safety program established for the various shops/work-centers? (AFI 91-301, para 7.3)

A5.2.3. (#) Did the unit ensure personnel were trained in special capabilities (e.g., ABM, rock crusher, concrete batch plant, etc) to meet peacetime and wartime requirements? (AFI 10-209, para 3.3 and Table 3.2)

A5.2.4. (#) Had personnel obtained required over-the-road movement plans for potential contingency or wartime operations? (AFI 10-209, para 4.4)

A5.2.5. Were required technical orders and allowance standards current and properly maintained? (AFI 10-209)

A5.2.6. (#) Did the unit maintain a special-purpose vehicle training program? (AFI 24-309, para 4.2)

A5.2.6.1. Were only qualified and properly licensed operators permitted to operate powered vehicles and equipment? (AFOSH 127-54 and AFI 24-309, para 4.2)

A5.2.6.2. Were crane operators certified and did they possess an AF Form 483, Certificate of Competency (Note: certification can be accomplished using in-house training/certification)? (AFOSH standard 91-46, para 8.24)

A5.2.7. (#) Did the electrical superintendent ensure all electrical work was completed IAW the latest version of the National Electrical Code, National Electrical Safety Code and OSHA? (AFI 32-1064, para 2)

A5.2.8. (#) Did personnel receive annual CPR proficiency training and was the training documented on the AF Form 55? (AFI 32-1064, para 2.13; AFOSHSTD 91-10, para 2.1.1.2)

A5.2.9. (#) Were workers properly equipped and trained to use and maintain tools and PPE, paying particular attention to rubber insulating protective equipment (rubber gloves, sleeves, line hoses, hoods, and covers) and hotline tools? (AFI 32-1064, para 2.11; AFOSHSTDs 91-10 and 12-13)

A5.2.10. (#) Did electrical insulating equipment receive required periodic electrical testing and were inspections performed prior to use? (AFI 32-1064, para 2.11; AFOSHSTDs 91-10 and 12-13)

A5.2.11. (#) Were rubber gloves and sleeves di-electrically tested every six months when assigned and in active use? (AFOSHSTD 91-31 para 3.6.4.8.3)

A5.2.12. (#) Were all other rubber goods tested IAW applicable guidelines? (AFOSHSTD 91-31)

A5.2.13. (#) Were hot line tools tested semi-annually? (AFJMAN 32-1082, para 15-18a)

A5.2.14. Were all personnel who were required to climb wooden poles being certified in pole climbing at least once a year? (OSHA Standard 1910.269)

A5.2.15. Was the Uniform Plumbing Code current edition available to shop personnel? (AFI 32-1066, Plumbing Systems, para 3.1)

A5.2.16. (#) Were all authorized Equipment Authorization Inventory Data (EAID) generators accounted for on the equipment custodian CA/CRL? (AFI-32-1063, para 3.2)

A5.2.17. (#) Were generators and light carts properly maintained, tested and exercised? (AFI 32-1063, para 7)

A5.2.17.1. Were historical records being maintained on all generator sets? (AFI 32-1063, para 5.5)

A5.2.18. Did Power Production personnel ensure that engine-lubricating systems were maintained IAW technical orders? (AFI 32-1062, para A3.4)

A5.2.19. Did power production personnel ensure that engine-cooling systems were maintained IAW technical orders? (AFI 32-1062, para A3.5)

A5.2.20. Was the explosive actuated fastening tool program properly managed? (AFM 91-201, para 2.2 & 2.3)

A5.2.21. Were craftsman certified by an authorized certification agency? (AFM 91-201)

A5.2.22. (#) Did the unit have an approved and coordinated Confined Space Entry Program (as applicable)? (AFOSH Std 91-25, Chap 2)

A5.2.23. Were necessary warning signs and barriers available and used by the workers? (AFOSH-STD 91-10, para 2.15)

A5.3. ENGINEERING

A5.3.1. Programming and Design

A5.3.1.1. Did the CECC have a design schedule for all projects to be designed in the fiscal year?

A5.3.1.2. (#) Was an appropriate design and construction information management system employed to track critical project data such as major design and construction milestones, design and construction status, project cost, etc.? (AFI 32-1023, para 5.7)

A5.3.1.3. Did engineers perform a comprehensive constructability review or equivalent? (AFI 32-1023, para 5.12)

A5.3.1.4. (#) Did Project Engineers and senior shop personnel/craftsmen review Engineering project designs during design reviews? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, chap 3)

A5.3.1.5. Were end-customers and appropriate USAF/USFK/host nation agencies involved in project design review? (AFI 32-1023, para 5.22)

A5.3.1.6. (#) Did Project Engineers ensure maintainability and reliability of proposed systems during design reviews? (AFPAM 32-1004V2, chap 3)

A5.3.1.7. (#) Was all required corrosion control (cathodic protection, industrial water treatment and protective coatings) provided on projects? (AFI 32-1054, paras 3.3, 3.4)

A5.3.1.7.1. Were projects designed IAW programming documents (DD Form 1391/1391 c), current CTLs and ETLs, and were design analyses which document design considerations and decisions and reference ETL/CTL compliance accomplished for all projects as required? (AFI 32-1023, para 5.1)

A5.3.1.8. Is an Air Force Engineering Technical Letter (ETL) and Construction Technical Letter (CTL) library current and available to all designers? (AFI 32-1023, para 2.1 and 2.2)

A5.3.1.9. Were projects designed IAW with latest AT/FP guidance? (Interim Department of Defense Antiterrorism/Force Protection Construction Standards, 16 Dec 1999 and Draft USCINCPAC Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection Construction Standards Interim Guidance, Nov 2000)

A5.3.1.10. Were all force protection requirements coordinated with Security Forces? (USAF Installation Force Protection Guide, Ch 2)

A5.3.2. Project Management

A5.3.2.1. (#) For each project, did project managers/inspectors maintain an inspection folder in which all aspects of preparation, daily entries and requirements for maintaining AF Form 1477, Construction Inspection Record, or equivalent, were correctly accomplished? (AFI 32-1023, para 6.5, 6.8)

A5.3.2.2. Did the project engineer continually review project folders to ensure they contained, at a minimum, a copy of approved project documents (DD Form 1391), required Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) documentation (AF Form 813/DD Form 1391c), project status reports, and a project schedule? (AFI 32-7061, Chap 3; AFI 32-1021, Chap 2; AFI 32-1023, para 6.5)

A5.3.2.3. Was proper project documentation maintained by the project engineer for each project, and at completion of the project, were copies of the documents and drawings needed for base record files turned over to using BCE? (AFI 32-1023, para 6.5)

A5.3.2.4. Was a DD Form 1354, transfer and acceptance of military real property, accurately completed for construction activities/real property transfers? (AFI 32-9005, para 3.2 through 3.5)

A5.3.2.5. Were post-occupancy inspections performed, as required (if applicable)? (AFI 32-1023, para 6.15)

A5.3.3. Site Development

A5.3.3.1. Did the site development section have sufficient drafting and survey equipment? (AS 429)

A5.3.3.2. Did personnel ensure surveying and lab equipment requiring periodic calibration was sent to TMDE or an approved contractor in accordance with manufacturers recommendations? (TO 00-02-14)

A5.4. READINESS

A5.4.1. (#) Was SORTS data properly calculated and reported for personnel, equipment and supplies, and training? (AFI 10-201, Chaps 3, 4 & 6)

A5.4.1.1. Did SORTS worksheets accurately reflect all data required to be reported? (AFI 10-201, Chaps 3, 4 & 6)

A5.4.2. Had the unit appointed a Disaster Preparedness representative to manage and coordinate unit aspects of the installation DP program? (AFI 32-4001, para1.13.1)

A5.4.3. (#) Had the unit developed and implemented response procedures and checklists to support local response plans (e.g. OPLAN 32-1), as well as war and contingency planning documents? (AFI 32-4001, para 1.13.3; AFI 32-4001, Sup 1, 1.13)

A5.4.3.1. Had the installation Civil Engineer Readiness Flight reviewed the unit checklists? (AFI 32-4001, Atch A2.2.9)

A5.4.3.2. Did UCC emergency response checklists cover all applicable contingency (peacetime accident and other contingency) scenarios based on assigned weapon systems and resources? (AFI 32-401, para 2.2.4; AFMAN 32-4004, Atch 2 and 4)

A5.4.4. (#) Had the unit established a unit control center and identified specialized teams, as required? (AFI 32-4001, para 1.13.8; AFI 32-4001, Sup 1, para 1.13)

A5.4.4.1. Did the UCC have the current, applicable standard DRF maps (e.g. crash grid map) and required contingency maps (e.g. installation NBC/ABGD sector map)? (AFI 32-4001, para 1.3.11)

A5.4.5. Were requirements for unit readiness personnel (3E9) included in the installation annual formal training submissions (if applicable)? (AFI 32-4001, para 6.2; AFI 32-4001, Sup 1, para 6.11)

A5.4.6. (#) Did the unit Readiness function identify and procure equipment, supplies, and applicable T.O.s/materials to support training and in-place and "deployed" operational requirements? (AFI 32-4001, para 3.1 and 3.2; T.O. 00-5-1)

A5.4.6.1. (#) Was readiness equipment properly maintained and stored in areas protected from fire, pilferage, extreme weather, humidity and dust and is it readily accessible? (Applicable T.O.s)

A5.4.6.2. Did the unit readiness function schedule equipment requiring calibration on a staggered basis to ensure adequate amounts on-hand for response operations? (AFI 32-4001, Sup 1, para 4.1.2; applicable equipment T.O.s)

A5.4.7. (#) Had the unit met individual skill area training requirements and any additional theater-specific training requirements? (AFI 10-209, para 3.2)

A5.4.7.1. Was a system established to track training data, is it current, and were training deficiencies flagged for resolution? (AFI 10-209, para 3.2)

A5.4.8. (#) Was proficiency training and professional development for Readiness personnel adequately managed and documented (i.e., OJT, to include in-house training)? (AFI 32-4001, para 6.2.2; AFI 32-4001, Sup 1, para 6.2.2)

A5.4.9. (#) Were readiness personnel trained and proficient in the following: Global positioning system plotting and reporting, map plotting using latitude/longitude and Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM), operationally check and use detection and reporting equipment, operate WeatherPak and other specialized equipment (if on-hand), and automated contaminant plume modeling software (e.g. VLS-TRACK)? (3E9XX CFETP)

A5.4.10. Were unit exercise evaluation team (EET) members assigned and trained to assess all areas tested during exercises, to include command and control/UCC operations, specific DOC requirements for UTCs, surface movement requirements, contamination control and avoidance, etc.? (AFI 32-4001, 5.4.1; AFI 32-4001, Sup 1, para 5.2.2; local IG Directive/Publication)

A5.4.10.1. Did the unit EET members have checklists or guidance, which outlined objectives and requirements? (AFI 32-4001, 5.4.2, AFI 32-4001, Sup 1, para 5.2.1 and 5.2.2)

A5.4.11. Did the unit participate in all required exercises? (AFI 32-4001, para 5.3; AFI 32-4001, Sup 1, para 5.2.1)

A5.5. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

A5.5.1. Manpower Management

A5.5.1.1. Did the unit manage its manpower matters to include advising the commander and workcenter supervisors on manpower standards application, variances, and authorization change requests? (AFI 38-201, Chap 2)

A5.5.1.2. Did the unit maintain, update, and track status of applicable changes to the Unit Manning Document (UMD), Unit Manpower Requirements (UMPR) document, authorization change requests (ACR), authorization change notices (ACN), and organizational change requests (OCRs)? (AFI 38-201, Chap 2)

A5.5.2. Financial Management

A5.5.2.1. (#) Did the resource advisor develop a comprehensive, valid and executable CE O&M (3400), 3080 (if applicable), and vehicle purchase budget for submission to HQ PACAF, 7 AF and other Commands? (DFAS-DE 7000.1-R; DoDI 4000.19; AFI 65-601V1, para 8.1.4, 8.16, & Chap 10; AFI 65-601V2, para 1.1)

A5.5.2.2. Did the resource advisor (functional area agreement coordinator) assist in the computation, verification and coordination of all support agreements? (DoDI 4000.19, para 4.6; AFI 25-201, para 2.4)?

A5.5.2.3. Did the resource advisor determine distribution of operating budgets and provide to the budget office the amounts by EEIC (and cost center where feasible) to be loaded into the accounting system? (AFI 65-601, Vol II, Atch 2)

A5.5.2.4. Did the resource advisor work with the cost center managers and RED HORSE commander to identify unfunded requirements and potential excesses? (AFI 65-601V2)

A5.5.2.5. Did the resource advisor train, guide and help cost center managers prepare budgets and consider cost center inputs in developing the final budget? (AFI 65-601V2)

A5.5.2.6. Did the resource advisor ensure that management control program evaluations were performed completely, accurately, and did they adequately support the year-end statement? (AFI 65-201, para 1.8)

A5.6. LOGISTICS MANAGEMENT

A5.6.1. (#) Did personnel ensure all material was inventoried at least annually, including annual review of residue assets to determine if turn-in was warranted, and material to be retained beyond 365 days was adequately justified? (AFPAM 32-1004V4, para 1.5 and 7.2)

A5.6.1.1. Did personnel establish a system to minimize accumulation and maximize use of residual material? (AFPAM 32-1004V4, para 1.5 and Ch 9)

A5.6.2. (#) Did the Chief of the Supply Section (or appointed individual) review and certify inventory results, investigate any unfavorable procurement/storage trends, and ensure inventory actions were expeditiously processed? (AFPAM 32-1004V4, para 7.2)

A5.6.3. Did personnel manage logistics-related audit reports to ensure property accountability (tools, equipment, materials) and audit trails existed for all material transactions, regardless of the inventory management system used? (AFPAM 32-1004V4, para 7.2)

A5.6.4. (#) Did the Chief of Supply Section ensure adequate warehousing of all RED HORSE material and monitor RED HORSE material storage-related facilities, including proper handling, storage and issue of hazardous and flammable material? (AFPAM 32-1004V4, para 1.5, Chaps 11, 19)

A5.6.4.1. Did warehouse personnel ensure material storage areas were in acceptable condition, all bins or storage compartments were labeled, and any required property transfers were completed? (AFPAM 32-1004V4, para 7.2)

A5.6.5. For projects and activities, did personnel generate the appropriate receiving records, update due-in files, and produce material receipt transactions for all in-coming items? (AFPAM 32-1004V4, para 2.2)

A5.6.6. Did the unit ensure requirements for hazardous materials were approved by the Hazardous Material Pharmacy (or base equivalent) prior to procurement? (AFPAM 32-1004V4, para 1.5)

A5.6.7. (#) Did personnel maintain required communications equipment, weapons and ammunition, and medical equipment, and were respective management programs implemented? (AFI 10-209, paras 2.7.4-2.7.6; AFCAT 21-209; AFI 21-208; AFI 31-207, Chap 2; respective Allowance Standards)

A5.6.8. (#) Did unit personnel perform a complete annual review of mobility readiness spares package (MRSP) to ensure the authorized parts were adequate to support assets? (AFI 10-209, para 4.8.1 and 4.8.2)

A5.6.9. Did the RED HORSE Chief of Supply monitor the unit DRMO program and act as a liason between host DRMO and supply IAW local guidance? (AFI 10-209, para 4.8.4.6)

A5.6.10. (#) Did personnel ensure there was a viable Due-In-From-Maintenance (DIFM) program, to include properly tracking accountability and forecasting funding requirements? (AFMAN 23-110V2, Part 2, Ch 24, AFI 10-209, para 4.8.4.11)

A5.6.11. Did personnel establish, maintain, and operate a locally-developed Individual Equipment program while in-garrison and deployed? (AFI 10-209, para 4.8.4.12)

A5.6.12. Were munitions annually forecasted? (AFCAT 21-209, para 1.1.2)

A5.6.13. Were out-of-cycle request properly documented and justified? (AFI 21-208, para 2.5)

A5.7. VEHICLE OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE - Utilize applicable portions of PACAFDIR 90-223, *Logistics Quality Assessment/Transportations,* Sections A1.2 and A1.3.

A5.8. SERVICES

A5.8.1. Training

A5.8.1.1. (#) Had the commander established a comprehensive education and training program to ensure all Services personnel were trained in their primary job responsibilities and in ancillary training required for their position? (AFI 34-254, paras 4.5 through 4.8)

A5.8.1.2. (#) Was there an overall written plan that outlined when and how all Home Station training (HST) will be conducted, and did the plan include all HST requirements? (AFI 10-214, Table 1; PRMG Ch 3 para 1b)

A5.8.1.2.1. Did Home Station Training consist of classroom education, hands-on equipment training, computer based training, and Ancillary training such as weapons qualification and self-aid and buddy care? (AFI 10-214, para 1.9.7 and 3.2.2)

A5.8.1.2.2. Was training documented in TEAMS (or an acceptable equivalent)? (AFI 10-214, para 1.13.3)

A5.8.1.3. Did the unit budget funds for training TDYs, SCT, Train the Trainer, and Prime RIBS Managers Course, as applicable? (AFI 10-214, para 1.11.2)

A5.8.1.4. Were Services personnel rotated through the host installation services unit, when applicable, to receive proficiency training? (AFI 10-209, para 4.9.6)

A5.8.1.5. Did personnel utilize exercises and deployments to train on Wartime Mortuary Operating Procedures? (AFI 10-209, para 4.9.3)

A5.8.1.6. Did the training manager develop a Services training plan? (AFI 34-254, para 3.1.1 and 4.6)

A5.8.2. Program Management

A5.8.2.1. (#) Was a locally developed safety program established for the various Services operations and functions? (AFI 91-301, para 7.3)

A5.8.2.1.1. Were team kits packaged, accessible and ready for short notice deployment/employment? (AFI 10-214, para 4.1)

A5.8.2.2. Had appropriate OIs, checklist, etc, been written in support of various base plans requiring Services support? (Prime RIBS Managers Guide, para 2.1)

A5.8.2.3. Were procedures established to organize available manpower to support extended hours of operation during contingencies? (AFI 10-214, para 1.9.3 and 1.9.3.1)

A5.8.2.4. Was required HST equipment available in accordance with Allowance Standard 429 Part M? (AFI 10-214, paras 1.9.2 and 3.2.3)

A5.8.2.5. (#) Were WRM rations properly stored (if applicable)? (AFI 34-239, para 7.3)

A5.8.2.6. Were rations stored by self-sustaining units issued on AF Form 1297, Temporary Issue Receipt, with a memorandum of understanding signed by the self-sustaining unit commander and were these rations accounted for on the WRM account? (AFI 34-239, para 7.3.5)

A5.8.3. Food Management

A5.8.3.1. (#) Were AF Forms 119-1, Field Feeding Monthly Monetary Report, submitted as required? (AFI 34-239, Atch 5 and 6)

A5.8.3.2. Were necessary steps taken and were forms kept on file for condemned food that is unfit for human consumption? (AFMAN 34-240, para 7.12.2)

A5.8.3.3. Were temperature charts available and used to document regular temperature checks of applicable refrigeration equipment (when in use)? (PACAF/SVX memo, PACAF Food Service Standards, 14 Feb 01)

A5.8.3.4. (#) Were hot foods maintained and served at 140 degrees or above? (Food Code 1997, para 3-501.16)

A5.8.3.5. (#) Were cold foods maintained and served at 41 degrees or below? (Food Code 1997, para 3-501.16)

A5.8.3.6. (#) Were temperature measuring devices calibrated as necessary to ensure their accuracy? (Food Code 1997, para 4.502.11)

A5.8.3.7. (#) Were nonfood items (detergents, cleaning agents, insecticides, etc.) kept separately or away from where food was stored or prepared? (Food Code 1997, para 7-201.11)

A5.8.3.8. (#) Did each refrigerator/freezer (if applicable) have an accurate thermometer and was it properly located for easy viewing? (Food Code 1997, para 4-204.112)

A5.8.3.9. (#) Were initial formal and annual Food Safety Training sessions being accomplished? (AFI 48-116, paras 2.1.4 and 2.1.5)

A5.8.3.10. (#) Did supervisors ensure food handlers utilized proper hygiene techniques (e.g. bathe daily, wash hands with soap and water after visiting the toilet, refraining from smoking, fingernails cut short and clean, proper hair restraints worn, etc.)? (Food Code 1997, para 2-3)

A5.8.3.11. (#) Were wristwatches, bracelets, and rings (except wedding and engagement rings, and medical information bracelets) not worn? (Food Code 1997, para 2-3)

A5.8.3.12. (#) Were dishwashing/sanitizing temperatures being maintained as specified? (Food Code 1997, paras 4-501.110 to 114 and 4-502.11)

A5.8.3.13. (#) Were outside garbage cans/refuse containers enclosed or covered and cleaned on a regular basis? (Food Code 1997, paras 5-501.13 and 5-501.16(A)(B))

A5.8.3.14. Were clean food equipment items and utensils stored at least 6 inches above the floor and either covered or inverted? (Food Code 1997, para 4-903)

A5.9. DEMOLITION TEAM

A5.9.1. (#) Was a locally developed safety program established for the shop/workcenter? (AFI 91-301, para 7.3)

A5.9.1.1. Did the unit develop an explosive safety lesson plan? (AFMAN 91-201, para 2.3 & 2.4)

A5.9.2. (#) Did personnel maintain required demolition tools and equipment and munitions for operational and training purposes? (AFI 10-209, para 2.7.8)

A5.9.3. (#) Were members of the demolition team trained as required? (AFI 10-209, Table 3.2)

A5.9.3.1. Were the required number of certified members qualified? (820th Pilot Unit Program (PUP), Explosive Demolition Training Reference Guide, Feb 01 Section I, para B.2)

A5.9.3.2. Had all demolition team Personnel completed the RED HORSE Explosive Demolition/ Quarry Course? (PUP, Sect I, para B.3.a)

A5.9.3.3. Had team members (active/inactive) holding the position of OIC, NCOIC, Explosive Safety Representative and their assistants successfully completed the two-week quarry course? (PUP, Sect I, para B.3.a and B.3.b. (2))

A5.9.3.4. Did each team member have an individual training folder that contained at a minimum, certificate of training and AF Form 797, Job Qualification Standard Continuation/Command JQS, detailing demolition duties? (AFI 36-2201, para 4.11.1.1.3)

A5.9.4. Were demolition team members conducting monthly classroom and practical training? (PUP, Sect I, para B.4.a)

A5.9.5. Did all personnel meet prerequisite requirements prior to being appointed to a demolition team? (PUP, Sect I, para B.3.b. (1), (3), (4), (5), (6))

A5.9.6. (#) Did the unit maintain all required demolition publications and documentation files? (PUP, Sect I, para B.6)

A5.9.7. (#) Did unit publish/maintain necessary operating instructions that covered the handling, demolition proficiency training, and transportation of explosives (as a minimum)? (AFMAN 91-201, Chapter 2 PUP, Sect XII, para 17)

A5.9.8. (#) Was the unit able to demonstrate proper demolition operations and procedures (task evaluations will be used to demonstrate compliance)? (T.O. 11A-1-66 & to 11A-1-42)

A5.9.8.1. Could the demolition team perform explosive operations using non-electric firing trains? (11A-1-66, para 3-3)

A5.9.8.2. Could the demolition team perform explosive operations using electrical firing trains? (11A-1-66, para 3-5)